



Dr. Judy Wood and the Future of the Earth

By Eric Larsen

Originally Published on "The Intrepid Report" Website – May – Nov 2012

DR. JUDY WOOD AND THE FUTURE OF THE EARTH: PART I

By Eric Larsen

Posted on May 10, 2012 by Eric Larsen

Everyone knows what's wrong with the poor remnant of news and analysis that the mainstream media still manages to provide—that it's untrue, servile to its corporate masters, and intended to deceive rather than reveal.

But what about the alternative? What about the commentary, analysis, and editorializing that's available mainly (or only) on the Internet, where the "free" worlds of speech and journalism still exist? How insightful are the writers *there*—and how reliable?

A few weeks ago in *Truthout* (March 23, 2012), William Rivers Pitt wrote "[The Finger of Fate Upon You](#)" in response to Occupy Wall Street's celebration of its first half-year's existence. OWS pulled together a gathering at Zuccotti Park—that was crushed by the cops.

How does the William Rivers Pitt essay hold up on the logic and reliability fronts?

Pitt opens his piece with a wide view, then narrows as he goes. He begins, in fact, with a withering recital of the horror, suffering, loss, victimization, penury, crime, torture, and death that the United States has visited upon itself and the world for the past decade—visitations that have earned and are still earning profits beyond telling for the criminals, racketeers, and vandals who planned them all in the first place.

Then, narrowing his focus, Pitt ends on a note of vibrant optimism. Turning to the Occupy Wall Street movement, he acknowledges the "extreme violence" that the protest met with last autumn and that it met with again at its half-year commemoration. Even so, he sends up a rallying cry. Only through OWS, only by keeping OWS alive, can we prevent the same criminals and villains as before from "[scaring] us back into the cowed submission that allowed this country to be plundered in an orgy of greed, fraud and state-sponsored for-profit murder abroad."

The same thing isn't going to happen again, he declares:

Never again. This is your time. This is our time. Let us show them what real American courage looks like, as we make for ourselves and our children the better country, and the better world, we know is possible.

And he ends with a three-paragraph imperative:

Right here.

Right now.

Occupy.

Many readers, I suspect, are likely to feel that Pitt has produced an eloquent, right-minded, even courageous piece. It strikes me differently. It fills me with dread.

Why? Well, there are two reasons. One is obvious, the other maybe less so.

The first reason is open and plain: The essay's subject is awful, terrifying, immense, easily capable of causing dread. After all, Pitt is talking about nothing other than the loss of the republic, along with our attendant freedoms, dignities, and rights. He is talking about our national government having been replaced by bodies of criminality. He's talking about the stealing in plain sight of our personal *and* national wealth by a tiny class of amoral and unaccountable oligarchs. And he's talking about the committing of unending military crimes and atrocities against peoples and nations across large expanses of the globe.

These are dreadful things, the ones Pitt is talking about—more so when he adds in the domestic war, the one being waged against we the people:

Meanwhile, millions of Americans are sitting in their homes with an acid bath at work in their stomachs, fear just behind their faces, because their family is all around them, and they don't want to let it show that the roof over their heads is hanging by a thread because the job just cut back hours and layoffs are imminent. A lot of people have stopped believing in the idea that hard work and dedication will carry them forward, because they are running as fast as they can just to stand still, and that's if they're lucky. A lot of people are going backwards,

even as the richest among us enjoy record profits, obscene bonuses and tax breaks that would make Marie Antoinette blush into her cake.

If a family does have to go on relief, well, good luck after November, because even the hardest-working families that need help might have to live up to the Republican ideal, which in the world of Mitt Romney and Paul Ryan and Rand Paul and Rick Santorum means there is no help, because real Americans don't need help, but have to pull themselves up by their bootstraps, whatever bootstraps are . . . and it really doesn't matter in the end, because poor people don't count anyway.

Who among us—that is, who among us if still in possession of mind, conscience, and human feeling—doesn't feel dread in the face of such subjects as these?

Bad enough. But worse is coming.

Pitt's intention, presumably, is to rally us. His aim is to unify us, via OWS, and thereby draw us into a position that will generate resistance against the crimes taking place inside our borders and out.

And so, you may well ask, just exactly how can such an aim such *not* be a good thing? How could it *not* be uplifting and encouraging instead of dread-causing?

For me, the answer is this: Pitt's appeal, noble-sounding and grand with its echoes of history, is actually made from a position of such weakness that it makes me fear all the more the success of the crimes and criminals he is calling on us to defy.

Pitt sets out to rally hope, but he defeats it instead. Pitt issues a summons to the ramparts, but leaking through the cracks in his words is a message that pain, ruin, and defeat lie ahead.

Untrue? Can't be so? Believe me, I devoutly wish it. But take a closer look.

When the recent OWS gathering took place in New York, "the movement was met with extreme violence almost from the moment it raised its head." Pitt finds a productive side to this violence, however. Since just about everyone today carries some form of instant communication, including cell phone cameras, any "extreme violence" that the police commit will end up coming back to haunt them. "The police," Pitt says, "have yet to catch on to the fact that everyone is a journalist in the 21st century, and their violent tactics no longer happen in the dark—and instead of dissuading people from joining in, their heavy-handed tactics will motivate them like never before."

Maybe so. Maybe seeing protesters, live, on video, or in email snapshots, being clubbed, cuffed, chained, Tased, pepper-sprayed, beaten, and dragged off to jail *will* have the effect of causing still more protesters to come forward and join the movement, swelling the ranks. Yes. But then what?

I mean, what will happen next? By what reason should we assume that larger numbers of protesters will cause a fundamental, or, say, a structural, change in the situation, digital cameras or not? Yes, ever greater numbers of people being brutalized will probably cause a *rhetorical* change in the situation. It will cause a rise in the intensity of feeling (on *both* sides, remember), and will increase the numbers of sympathizers (but again, on *both* sides).

And so the same question: What happens then? Can we really hope, let alone believe, that protests in the manner and style of the 1960s or 1970s (or the 1910s or 1930s) can or will bring about *political* change when they're undertaken in the 2010s, an age when criminals run the country, when they vie for its highest leadership, when the "battleground" in the "war on terror" has been extended so that it exists *everywhere*, so that anyone, whether in Zuccotti park or in their bathtub, can, if declared a terrorist-sympathizer, be tossed into jail for keeps, with no evidence, no counsel, no *Habeas Corpus*, no trial, no appeal, no nothing. Read all about it [here](#), if you haven't already.

Listen, my heart goes out to OWS. I went down to Zuccotti Park last September to join them, visit them, talk with them. I donated books to their library, new ones, worth around four hundred bucks (some of the many books the cops kindly tossed into the back of a dumpster). But what *political* effect can OWS hope to have? William Rivers Pitt himself seals the deal for their defeat when he writes, as I cited before:

If a family does have to go on relief, well, good luck after November, because even the hardest-working families that need help might have to live up to the Republican ideal, which in the world of Mitt Romney and Paul Ryan and Rand Paul and Rick Santorum means there is no help, because real Americans don't need help, but have to pull themselves up by their bootstraps, whatever bootstraps are . . . and it really doesn't matter in the end, because poor people don't count anyway.

Does Pitt really think that *that* cautionary note will somehow not be carried over and reapplied by his readers when they come to the end of his piece and find him, like a matador with a red cape, tempting, teasing, luring, cajoling, *daring* them to do anything other than stream blindly into the open maw of patriotic gore?

Look at the long silk scarf of demagoguery he pulls out of his magician's hat:

Never again. This is your time. This is our time. Let us show them what real American courage looks like, as we make for ourselves and our children the better country, and the better world, we know is possible.

"Never again," he says, meaning that never again must "we" let them scare us back into the cowed submission that allowed this country to be plundered in an orgy of greed, fraud and state-sponsored for-profit murder abroad.

What's wrong with this language that simultaneously castigates and implores? Well, for one thing, it posits something as being real that isn't real at all. In the phrases "scare us" and "cowed submission," what can Pitt be referring to if not 9/11? The implication is obvious: That *now* things are different than they were back in 2001; *now* nobody is going to be suckered into accepting tyranny and the loss of freedom, terrified into it by the single biggest display of terrorism in the country's history.

Oh? Well, if there's been a sea change in attitude toward and understanding of the facts and meanings of 9/11, then why isn't OWS aimed at exposing and opposing that source of tyranny and wretchedness instead of exposing and opposing Wall Street as the source of tyranny and wretchedness?

The unhappy answer is that there has not been any such sea change in attitude or understanding toward or of 9/11, for reasons that I will discuss in detail later. In the meantime, there isn't going to be a sea change any time soon in psychopaths and mental defectives like "Mitt Romney and Paul Ryan and Rand Paul and Rick Santorum," whether or not any of them finds a way into in the "highest office." They and those like them are complicit in a heist as big as any that the 1% has pulled off, namely the blackmail/buy-up of the Republican party and its repackaging as a monolithic and apolitical body with the brains, subtlety, depth, and flexibility of a fire hydrant. Take a look at [Paul Krugman](#) on the subject. Politics of compromise have been put on hold while absolutism holds sway.

"This is your time," Pitt says to his readers, visions of 1968 dancing in his head. "This is our time." What's with this "your" and "our"? Does he mean we're all in the ruins together? I wonder. "Let us show them what real American courage looks like," he exhorts. Some may hear in his voice a principled and urgent plea to come forward and help save the nation. I don't. It's not a sound plan, this plan he says is the only one. The voice I hear is the carnival barker: "Step right up and up pass through the door, be the next one to be roughed up, taken down, beaten up, shot down, Tased, cuffed, locked up—and forgotten."

It makes a person wonder which side Pitt is really working for. Sacrificing kids and grandmothers in the tens, hundreds, or thousands isn't going to melt the monstrous heart of a Romney, a Dimon, a Blankfein, a Scott, a Clinton, or an Obama. It's not going to get the National Defense Authorization Act sent back to committee for rewriting, let alone shredding. It's not going to make the Patriot Act turn to ashes, or shut down Guantanamo, or bring about fair trials, or restore Jose Padilla's sanity, or bring about acquittal for Bradley Manning, or. . . .

Whether you're reading something on paper or reading something online, read it closely and read it carefully. There are [serpent songs in America](#) where you might least expect them. More next time.

Eric Larsen is the publisher and editor of The Oliver Arts & Open Press.

DR. JUDY WOOD AND THE FUTURE OF THE EARTH: PART II

By Eric Larsen

Posted on **June 5, 2012** by Eric Larsen

In the [part one of this essay](#), I examined a [piece by William Rivers Pitt](#) that looked at first like a genuine summoning of the masses to fight the destroyers of our nation and people. On closer study, however, as a rallying cry, the piece, showed itself to be weak, empty, outmoded, and doomed.

At worst, it was as if Pitt were purposely misleading his readers, luring them into the maw of the cannon. At best, it was as if he really had no idea what to do in the face of our present, enormous, endgame emergency. So he just swooned onto an old sofa piled with cushions of worn-out tropes—tatters, rags, slogans of the 1970s.

The truth is that he may as well just have thrown up his hands and said, “I don’t have the least idea what to do.”

That failure wouldn’t matter, Pitt’s giving up (even if he didn’t *think* he was giving up) and throwing in the towel—if he were the only one doing it. But he’s not. The “Pitt syndrome” is all but epidemic. It pops up everywhere, like mushrooms. All kinds of Pitt-like writers—appearing to be scrupulous, conscience-driven, and serious—labor to name, identify, and describe the ruinous criminality everywhere around us, only to conclude, like Estragon in *Waiting for Godot*, “Nothing to be done.”

Are things that bad? Are we really that passive, helpless, and paralyzed? Well, let’s look at some examples.

In *Counterpunch* earlier this year (Feb. 13, 2012), Diana Johnstone ran a piece called “[Road to Damascus . . . and on to Armageddon?](#)” After giving a nod to [Ron Suskind’s famous article](#) (Oct. 17, 2004), where an aid to Dubya was quoted as saying “We’re an empire now, and . . . we create our own reality,” Johnstone wrote:

Because, in the minds of our political ruling class, the United States has the power to “make reality,” we need pay no attention to the remnants of whatever reality we didn’t invent ourselves.

Our artificial reality is coming into collision with the reality perceived by most or at least much of the rest of the world. The tenants of these conflicting views of reality are armed to the teeth, including with nuclear weapons capable of leaving the planet to insects.

The situation is another “us” and “them” situation, as it was with Pitt. In the earlier case, the “them” were the people with guns (cops), and the “us” were the ones without (OWS). In the Johnstone case, the “them” are those with their own “created reality” and the “us” are—well, they’re us, with our “normal reality.” On the subject of “their” reality and “ours,” Johnstone wonders how most people would answer the following question: “Which is more important, ensuring disgruntled Islamists freedom to overthrow the secular regime in Syria, or avoiding World War Three?” Her own guess: “I’ll bet that there might be a majority for avoiding World War III.” A majority, in short, that would be for a “normal reality.”

The stage is thus set for her essay, which she duly writes. Here is her last-but-one paragraph:

Western politicians and media are not yet fighting World War III, but they are talking themselves into it. And their actions speak even louder than words . . . notably to those who are able to understand where those actions are leading. Such as the Russians. The West’s collective delusion of grandeur, the illusion of the power to “make reality,” has a momentum that is leading the world toward major catastrophe. And what can stop it?

Indeed, “what can stop it?” And there it is, the one, single, greatest question, the question everyone should be exploring, examining, and—I live in optimism—answering: *What can stop* the unspeakable, multi-faceted criminality, the ongoing program of terror, repression, threat, imprisonment, torture, brigandage, and murder that the United States has been pursuing steadily since the catalyst, trigger, perfect excuse, and starting gate of 9/11?

Here is Johnstone’s answer: “A meteor from outer space, perhaps?”

Can anyone, I ask, conceivably grow more helpless, hopeless, and passive than *that*? I suppose, in fairness, we’ve got to allow that Johnstone may, with a gallows humor, have been joking. It ain’t much of a joke, though, and Johnstone’s hands are thrown up even higher than Pitt’s, in her case all the way up to the stars.

What is it, exactly, and exactly where does it come from, in writers like Johnstone, Pitt, and so many others (“How do we put love into collective motion?” asks the wistful [Robert Koehler](#), while, even more wan with desire, [William T.](#)

Hathaway pines that “We, the people of the world, have to take control of the forces that shape our lives,” and Professor Peter Phillips finally puts his foot down: “We cannot allow extrajudicial killings”), this quality of impotence, of weakness, of thinking that’s so completely unleveraged and powerless? The question sweeps me back to 1958 or so and high school physics. It’s as though writers like these have two things but are hopelessly missing a third. They’ve got a huge boulder and a crowbar—and, yes, an unrelenting desire to dislodge that boulder. What they’re missing, though, is a fulcrum—a smaller boulder, say, or a block of sturdy oak—that would let them transform their crowbar from simply a long stick of iron into something very, very different. They could, with a fulcrum, transform it into a lever, a thing possessed of almost miraculous power, more than enough to lift, dislodge, and get rid of a boulder.

Any hope of answering this question—what is it that’s *wrong* with our left and liberal writers?—in a meaningful way and also a clear one will require two preparatory steps—maybe more. The first is to look closely at an example or two of what I call “impotent writing” or “writing of impotence.” And the second is to pin down the origin or cause of this wan and sickly way of writing and thinking. This step is the more complicated of the two, and I doubt that we’ll get to it until part three of this essay.

Earlier I said that examples of what I then called “the Pitt syndrome,” or the syndrome of “throwing in the towel,” were so abundant as to be epidemic. Unfortunately, it’s true. Examples are everywhere, as we’ve seen hints of above. They come in varying categories, types, and strains, and the majority of them, I’m quite sure, are written in and with the very best of intentions. Another type—the category of the lying, deceitful, and invidious, we might call it—is another matter, and we’ll deal with it in turn.

For now, though, let’s take a piece like **America is under attack!** by William T. Hathaway. Perfectly correct in its essential premise, that “Even fanatics like al-Qaeda aren’t really aggressors,” it is also perfectly correct in its next logical step, namely that

If people knew this—knew how easy it would be to stop terrorism—they wouldn’t want to fight this war. That’s why the media ignore al-Qaeda’s demands. Western leaders don’t want people to see that the war’s real purpose isn’t to stop terrorism but to control the resources of this region. They actually *want* [emphasis in original] the terrorism because that gives them the excuse they need—the threat of an evil enemy.

To create “The threat of an evil enemy” was, of course, exactly why 9/11 was shaped, molded, and brought into existence in the first place—with such excellent and profitable results that the happy wasters, killers, and destroyers are still capitalizing on them a decade later. How can such criminal and demonic policies have dragged on unimpeded for so long? Well, Hathaway himself, as an impotence-writer, demonstrates *one* of the many reasons for our years of terror having stretched on for so long as they have. In regard to the terrorists (in regard, that is, to us) he asks exactly the right question. The trouble is that then, immediately afterward, he tumbles right off the wagon and gives exactly the wrong answer.

To put both the question and the answer into context, we need another paragraph. Hathaway’s real subject, it turns out is capitalism:

Capitalism is always at war. The violence, though, is often abstract: forcing us either to accept low-paying, exhausting jobs or starve; denying us adequate health care, education, and economic security; convincing us that human beings are basically isolated, autonomous units seeking self-gratification. But when this doesn’t suffice to keep their profits growing, the violence becomes physical, the cannons roar, and the elite rally us to war to defend “our” country and destroy the fiendish enemy. Motivating us to kill and die for them requires a massive propaganda campaign—America is under attack!—which we confront whenever we turn on their media.

Now we’re positioned to understand the correctly-asked question. And this is it: “Why do they do this? Are they monsters?”

But then comes the incorrect answer. Look closely to see if you can find the impotence-signal:

No, they’re not. They’re just human beings serving an inhuman system. Capitalism is inherently predatory. It demands aggressive growth. It’s either dominate or go under.

The impotence-signal is made out of one part false logic and one part sentimentality. Both elements are dirt-common in impotence-think, though it’s almost impossible to choose which is the more destructive.

Let’s take the false logic first. The propagandists, war mongers, and greedy profiteers, says Hathaway, are *not* monsters. But why on earth *not*? Aren’t they liars, killers, and cheaters? And aren’t they also free agents, responsible and accountable, like everyone else in the universe, for their own actions?

The answers to these questions seem to me to be yes, yes, and yes (for the lying, killing and cheating), and then yes and yes again (for the free agency and the accountability).

But in Hathaway's view, I've apparently got it all wrong. In his view, it looks as though the five "correct" answers aren't "yes," but, instead, Doesn't matter, Doesn't matter, Doesn't matter, and then twice more, Doesn't matter, Doesn't matter.

How can it possibly be that lying, killing, and cheating don't *matter*? Well, hold on half a second and I'll show you. In Hathaway's own words, the reason why such sinners as these *aren't* monsters is because:

They're just human beings serving an inhuman system. Capitalism is inherently predatory. It demands aggressive growth. It's either dominate or go under.

Pardon me? At this point I must ask a question of very great importance. It's this: Where can or could an "inhuman system" come from if not from the minds and efforts of human beings? And the answer is: Nowhere.

No differently from any other similar systems—systems of philosophy, for example, of political order, or of religious belief—economic systems are created neither by nature nor by divinity, but solely and only by human beings and through no other agency or force than human ones. Whether a resulting construct is or is not "an inhuman system," the fact remains that that construct was created by human beings and that human beings, therefore, are *responsible* for it, *whatever* its nature may be.

I raise this subject not because I want to praise capitalism, and not because I want to condemn it—at least not here and now. I raise it, instead, in order to expose one of the truly insidious, destructive, and all but omnipresent elements in impotence-writing and impotence-think. Hathaway's false logic leads to—or reveals—something even worse than the false logic itself. This worse thing is a form of blindness, a form of not-seeing what's real. Mixed in with this not-seeing, or perhaps even an actual part of this not-seeing, is an element of sentimentality that results in a profoundly debilitating moral paralysis.

Consider thinkers who are handicapped by the debilities we're talking about. What do such thinkers see when, like Hathaway, they turn their eyes toward and actually look at liars, murderers, war-makers, and thieves at the very moment when they're doing their lying, murdering, war-making, and stealing?

If we follow the Hathaway template, we know, as we've already seen, that such thinkers do not see "monsters." And what do they see instead? They see *victims*. Physically and literally, of course, their eyes are in fact looking at industriously-functioning liars, murderers, war-makers, and bandits, since that's what such people actually are—or what they actually are in "normal reality." But the fact is that impotence-thinkers no longer think or see within or by means of what others of us may call normal reality. They see in another kind of reality. They see in *their* kind of reality, or in *their* kind of seeing.

And in their kind of seeing the thing actually looked at is not the same as the thing that's seen. Impotence-thinkers look right past, or straight through, the actual, the physical, or the real thing—or, another way of expressing it, they imbue that real thing with attributes that it may not actually have. Most often, the actual, real, physical thing is sentimentalized by the impotence-thinker and then, at one and the same time, also made into an abstraction.

The sentimentalizing step helps explain how an impotence-thinker can look at liars, murderers, war-makers, and thieves and see them not as criminals or "monsters" but as figures who are exploited and victimized (as well they may be, though at the same time they're still criminals and still accountable for being so). And, next, the *abstracting* element of impotence-thought explains how it can be that the very object (that is, these criminals) before the seer's eyes gets changed into something else. In this case, the seen object is liars, murderers, war-makers, and thieves. But they get changed. They get changed from the specific concretes of liars, murderers, war-makers, and thieves into the abstraction of *the victims that are created by capitalism*.

Now that we've come this far, I hope that it's becoming easier to get an idea of how evasive, toothless, self-limiting, self-cancelling—paralyzing, diversionary, and self-imprisoning—impotence-thought really is.

Part of the reason for the half-blindness, indecisiveness, and unassertiveness of impotence-thinking can be understood by remembering that this kind of thinking, or this kind of seeing, had a major part of its origin and formation in the "false kindnesses" of political correctness, a naïve and limited set of attitudes wherein the highest aim and sole end of all liberal social existence was, or is, to make sure that *no one whatsoever, at any time, ever has his or her feelings hurt*. For people to live in accordance with that kind of guideline or that kind of governing purpose requires absolutely that they see life in a euphemized and simplified way, as being made up of elements far less complex than it really is made up of, and, perhaps most important of all, that they *approach* life from a philosophic stance that is much, much, much more passive than it is assertive, aggressive, or active.

It's far easier, it's far softer, it requires far less energy, assertiveness, or action—and, most damning of all, it requires far less courage—to label criminals as being the passive victims of a superior and venal system than it is to declare them the criminals that they actually are and to punish them appropriately and accordingly.

The emotional-intellectual simplification that accompanies impotence-thought, that in fact is a central component of impotence-thought, cannot, however much a person may wish it otherwise, be denied. Does the process of thinking through difficult matters such as these possibly make it more understandable that while not a single person who was a member of Congress on 9/11, and not a single person who has been a member of Congress since then, that not a single one of these is exempt from the crime of treason for having abused their oath of office, for having broken international law, for having been party to a breaching of the Geneva Conventions, and for having subverted, betrayed, and soiled the Constitution of the very republic they serve—that all of this is true and yet not a single one of them has been challenged, summoned, tried, or punished under the law?

Why not? Why have we allowed more than ten years to pass without making certain that such accountability has been brought to bear upon those most obviously deserving of it?

The villain, the enemy, the one responsible for so heinous a dereliction, is us. It's we who are to blame. It's us, the so-called liberal and progressive and left constituency in the national dialogue. It's us who've done too little—who've done, in fact, very nearly nothing. The ranks of the left have softened and devolved to the point where they are almost as worthless standing on their two hind legs as they would be if they fell out of existence altogether. Their eyes are faulty, seeing that which isn't there and failing to see that which is. Their philosophic minds are simplified, their brains fuzzy with euphemism, they themselves paralyzed, while and courage is an echo from lost and distant days.

We are wan, pale, weak. We are twittery. We are full of words and yet are saying nothing. If you and I were sitting now in a class of Freshman English, and if this passage, say, from **"Big Greed," by Missy Comley Beattie**, were the passage to be analyzed for that day's class, how would it fare? Imagine that the class, guided by its instructor, evaluated it for the maturity and subtlety of its premise, the sturdiness of its logic, the continuity of its thought, and for its overall persuasiveness to a reader—would it be rated as excellent and be given an "A"? Or as average, and a "B-minus" or a "C"? Or would it end up being considered "poor," and thus given a "D" or lower?

There it is, then, an assignment for you to complete before next time. As you work on it, keep in mind the real underlying question: Is this, or isn't this, a piece of impotence-writing? And the corollary question: Is this, or isn't this, an example of impotence-thought?

Be thorough. Think carefully. Good luck.

The Occupy Movement mustn't be suppressed or co-opted. It's all we've got. To construct a new system, a force whose strength incapacitates Big Greed, we need creative strategy. And we must be brave. If we can accomplish this, there will be no need to write articles on behalf of Bradley Manning. There will be no war. No war crimes to expose. It will be unnecessary to work for a healthy environment, peace, income equality, or civil rights.

Next: Leverage and lies.

Eric Larsen is author of ***A Nation Gone Blind: America in an Age of Simplification and Deceit***, and of ***The Skull of Yorick: The Emptiness of American Thinking at a time of Grave Peril—Studies in the Cover-up of 9/11.***

DR. JUDY WOOD AND THE FUTURE OF THE EARTH: PART III

By Eric Larsen

Posted on **July 25, 2012** by **Eric Larsen**

In the **previous part of this essay** I asked this question: How it can possibly be the case that over a decade has passed with not one guilty person, institution, corporation, or group having been made accountable, under law, either for the monstrous and treasonous crimes themselves of September 11, 2001, or for the horrendous and on-going crimes, domestic and foreign, that have been committed with impunity—and that continue to be committed with impunity—with the mammoth and transparent lie of 9/11 as excuse, fulcrum, and catalyst?

That was the question. This was the answer:

The villain, the enemy, the one responsible for so heinous a dereliction, is us. It's we who are to blame. It's us, the so-called liberal, progressive, and left constituency in the national dialogue. It's us who've done too little—who've done, in fact, very nearly nothing. The ranks of the left have softened and devolved to the point where they are almost as worthless standing on their two hind legs as they would be if they fell out of existence altogether. Their eyes are faulty, seeing that which isn't there and failing to see that which is. Their philosophic minds are simplified, their brains fuzzy with euphemism, they themselves paralyzed, while . . . [actual] courage is an echo from lost and distant days.

The group of "us" whom I'm talking about, this failed and pathologically timid omnium-gatherum of observers, analysts, journalists, and writers, is, if nothing else, large. In **Part I** of this essay, I discussed **William Rivers Pitt** in his role as a member of it, and in **Part II** I added **Diana Johnstone**, **Robert Koehler**, **William T. Hathaway**, and **Professor Peter Phillips**. I am now about to add another to the ranks of those who practice "impotence-writing," a mode, as we saw last time, born out of and limited by what I call "impotence-thinking." The addition is the writer Missy Beattie, whom I introduced at the end of Part II.

Some may remember the invitation I made, asking readers to consider Beattie's short essay "**Big Greed**" as if it had been submitted in a freshman English class and were now being analyzed there. What grade would it get, I asked, if it were "evaluated for the maturity and subtlety of its premise, the sturdiness of its logic, the continuity of its thought, and its overall persuasiveness to a reader." Would it get an "A"? Or would it get a "B-minus" or "C" as reward for being average? Or would it get a "D" or less, for being poor?

Underlying those questions was—and is—the most important one of all: Is this piece, or isn't it, a piece of "impotence writing"?

Not many turned up to help with the task of grading, but that's not a surprise, since many people tend to avoid work when they can, but it's also unsurprising for a more important reason. Most people shy away when it comes to making analytic judgments about writing. They do this because they feel shaky, weak, intimidated—or also presumptuous toward those they're "criticizing," or even as if they're taking unfair advantage of them—when it comes to the serious evaluation of serious writing. Understandable? Maybe. Excusable? That's a harder question. The truth is that this wide-spread American syndrome of deficiency and self-doubt when it comes to analysis of writing is one of the crucial national deficiencies now allowing us to be led so swiftly as we are from freedom to tyranny.

One of the people who wrote in did so not to analyze the writing in "Big Greed" but to address the related and prior subject of the decay and impotence that have taken the stuffing out of what was once an active progressive left. This contributor, Randall Tillotson, recognized immediately the monumental emergency now facing us whereby we are not only losing republic, liberty, law, safety, freedom, and Constitutional rights and protections, but whereby, on top of all that, we appear to be saying good-bye to these things not with a fiercely fought resistance but *willingly*. Tillotson saw immediately that any means or strength that could ever hope to lead to an escape from this *Gottterdammerung* would have to come from one place only: From the strengths, reserves, instincts, principles, and capacities of the *single, irreducible, individual self*. Only if we can hang on to our individual selfhood, or only if we can *reawaken* our now-drugged or all but dead individual selfhood, can—or *will*—we ever fight back.

A people has no force and never will have force if it isn't made up of absolute individuals. But in America today, the withering and ruinous truth is that the individual self is in a diseased, enfeebled, perverted, malignant, near-death condition. Tillotson likens this condition to one of being controlled by demons or false gods. "We are in the midst of an Armageddon of the mind," he writes, and goes on to say that:

Buddhists would call these false gods "makyo," or delusions. If this is true, as it appears to be, then we are in the midst of a final battle where it is up to each of us to defeat these false gods, who are actually demons that have invaded our minds. Forget about organizations and marching, which do virtually nothing but [result in] . . . a display of black block infiltrators that [make] . . . the impotent look even more foolish. It's up to each of us to cast out the demons within our own minds, the demons of false beliefs generated by traitors and liars.

The "demons" inside the minds of Americans constitute the disease that makes necessary the writing of emergency essays like the one I'm writing here, a lengthy conversation that steps from one related spot to another a bit as if I were a lone person trying to stomp out a brush fire. What Tillotson says is true, literally and absolutely. Traitors and liars, plentiful among us, planted the demons, germinated, nursed, and harvested them—then bent themselves to the long industrious toil of planting those demons over and over again, crop after crop, not in the soil of the republic but in the minds of one generation of consumer-Americans after another, planting them all the way back, first, in the minds of those who were young in the 1950s, then those coming of age in the 60s, 70s, and 80s, on into the 90s, then through the yawning gateway of the millennium itself and at last to the perfection of the final, inevitable, diseased harvest: A nation so perverted spiritually, internally, and intellectually that it willingly, and contentedly, even eagerly, embraces its own destruction, its own transformation into an economically bankrupt terrorist police state at home, a military-terrorist gestapo aggressor everywhere abroad.

For anyone to “agree” or “disagree” with all of what I’ve just said may not matter very much, at least not right now. What does matter, though, is this question: What in the name of all the gods that have ever been imagined do these vast and appalling enormities have to do with the tiny little question of deciding on a grade for an op-ed piece called “Big Greed” that happens to have been written by one Missy Beattie?

A good question. And a question that has to do with our previous one, the one about the single, irreducible, individual self.

No mob ever won a revolution, and no mob ever founded a just nation. Only a *people* can do that. And, once more, there has never been any such thing as a people unless every member of it, or by far the greater number of them, has been in possession of, *and aware of*, a single, individual, irreducible self.

And so we come to the reason why our progressive left of today is nothing like the muscular progressive left of another time. Randall Tillotson, in his comment on [Part Two](#) of this essay, asks an enormous and enormously important question: “How is it,” he asks, “that all these American anti-war and leftist groups are such utter failures?” He then lists the failed groups he’s thinking of:

America First Committee

American League Against War and Fascism

American Peace Mobilization

A.N.S.W.E.R. (also known as International ANSWER and ANSWER Coalition)

Another Mother For Peace

Anti-War Committee

Antiwar.com

Campus Antiwar Network

Campaign for Liberty

Committee for Nonviolent Revolution

Center on Conscience & War (formerly known as NISBCO)

Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors

The Council for National Interest

Code Pink: Women for Peace

Common Dreams

Coffee Strong

ChildVoice International

GI Rights Network

Gold Star Families for Peace

Iraq Veterans Against the War

Iraq Peace Action Coalition

LewRockwell.com

Long Island Alliance for Peaceful Alternatives

Military Families Speak Out (not anti-war, opposed only to war in Iraq)

National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam

National War Tax Resistance Coordinating Committee

Nevada Shakespeare Company

Not in Our Name

Peace Action

Port Militarization Resistance

September Eleventh Families for Peaceful Tomorrows

Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee

Students for a Democratic Society

The World Can't Wait

Troops Out Now Coalition

United for Peace and Justice

Veterans for Peace

Vietnam Veterans Against the War

War Resisters League

Tillotson himself is drawn to the far from illogical suspicion that these groups are impotent because, like Occupy Wall Street and the 9/11 Truth Movement, they've been infiltrated by agencies, organizations, and individuals whose job it is to make certain that the "host" groups become and remain powerless. Says Tillotson, "The only reasonable conclusion to draw would be that these many organizations are simply the controlled opposition, puppets on display for the appearance of resistance."

Maybe. Probably. Perhaps for sure. But for the purposes of our subject right here and now—that is, the subject of the single, individual, irreducible self—the foremost question isn't whether such infiltration has or hasn't taken place, or on what scale, but, instead, it's this two-part question: First, why are these progressive-left groups so powerless? And, second, if they're as thoroughly infiltrated as Tillotson suggests, *why was the process of infiltration so easy?*

And these questions lead to another question, one we've already seen. Namely: Who actually constitutes these groups? Does the membership of each group consist of single, individual, irreducible selves? Does the membership consist of people who can see for *themselves* rather than through the eyes of others? Does it consist of people who can *think* for themselves rather than copying the thought of others? Does it consist of people who can *act* for themselves rather than merely following others? Whether in a group or not in a group, every single person, if that person hopes to exist in a condition that is a meaningful one, must be and must remain a free agent. Writers like William Rivers Pitt and Chris Hedges insist repeatedly that we must "join," must "unite," must "act together," must fill the streets and be beaten on the head, maced, pepper-sprayed, and Tased, all in order to "**show them what real American courage looks like.**"

What presumption, tripe, and hogwash. "Leaders" of this tally-ho sort call for blindness every bit as much as they do for sightedness. Again and again they call for "groups" to form, without first giving a thought to the free-agency and individual selfhood that alone can result in a group's possessing *intelligence*; they call for "groups" to form without first asking for—or thinking of—the single, individual, irreducible selfhood that, as with free-agency, makes the difference between meaningful partisan power on the one hand and the evanescent weightlessness, on the other, of crowds that are held together by hunch, by golly, and above all by *feeling*, this being something, however powerful it can be at times, that is guaranteed also, by its very nature, to be ephemeral.

Who *are* these people who keep calling us into the streets even though they're themselves without a program or plan of action? Or, for that matter, who are *we*, who are *us Americans*, a so-called "people" that sits by and does nothing as wealth, economy, resources, Constitution, law, freedom, justice, the republic itself are stolen, taken, or outright

destroyed by criminals, brigands, thieves, and con artists, all parading, in an ungodly charade, as “government,” as “leadership,” or as one kind or another of “national institution”?

Well, with all this going on and us doing nothing to stop it, we must be among the dumbest, the most debased, the most caponized, the most snookered, the most pitiable of “peoples” in the history of the world. God help us, especially now, as we seem incapable of helping ourselves.

* * *

A note on writing and the self: No tool, device, or system has ever been discovered that’s better suited than the one known as *writing* for purposes of revealing, accurately and thoroughly, the quality, content, makeup, or existence of the individual self of the writer.

If you happen to be timid, uninformed, or shallow, and if you happen not to want these qualities known to the world—then *don’t be a writer*. If you happen to be self-deluded and to suffer from a Napoleonic complex, and if you happen not to want these qualities known to the world—then *don’t be a writer*. If it happens that you have a deep negative prejudice toward a certain kind of—but you get the point. The truth about you will come out in what you write. It will be revealed by what you *do* say, and it will be revealed by what you *don’t* say. It will be revealed by *how* you write and by how you *don’t* write. If it isn’t revealed in your words themselves, it will be revealed through the spaces, echoes, and meanings between the words, a little bit like fresh mortar being squeezed out between newly-laid bricks. It will be revealed by words you do use and by words you don’t use; by phrasings, sentence types, and elements of style that you do use and by those you that you don’t. It will be revealed by things you emphasize and by things you neglect, by things you repeat too much and by things you fail to mention. Writing—for that matter language itself, although all the more so when it’s written—will reveal you in a hundred different ways when you don’t even know it’s doing so and when you may not even know what those ways *are*. To write is to take the risk of exposures great and small. Caveat scriptor.

Now, after this reminder of how complex a task it is, and how delicate, it’s clear that not enough room is left for grading “**Big Greed**,” and the project will have to be put off until next time. This may be a reprieve for some, if they intended to send in their evaluations but ran out of time. Now they have another chance.

I also suspect that it’s time for me to say something about the title I have given this essay, “Dr. Judy Wood and the Future of the Earth.” I chose the title carefully, mean it literally, and use it in absolute seriousness. This essay is about the future of our nation. But it is also about the future of the Earth and of all life on it.

Let me explain. The shocking but plain and simple truth about 9/11 is that on September 11, 2001, the twin towers, and some hours later WTC 7, did not collapse, were not weakened to the point of collapse by heat from burning jet fuel, and were not “brought down” in any kind of “controlled demolition” at all, whether through the use of thermate, thermite, mini nukes, or any other kind of conventional, unconventional, or high-intensity explosive material, including plain old TNT. The buildings did cease to exist, but neither explosions nor the presence of high heat had anything to do with the cause of their disappearance. What happened to them instead is that they were subjected to forces created by directed free-energy technology being used in a weaponized form. The existence of free-energy technology was well known to Nicola Tesla (1856–1943), but from a time even before that genius’ death, both the knowledge of free-energy itself and the fact of there having been continued scientific research into it have been fiercely guarded and powerfully suppressed. As a result, few Americans know very much at all about free-energy, its nature, its potential, or its applications. As a result of their scrupulously maintained ignorance, when Americans do hear about it, they’re likely to brush it off as the stuff of Hollywood movies or science fiction.

But it isn’t that. It is quite real, in fact absolutely and entirely so, as Dr. Judy Wood proves in ***Where Did the Towers Go: Evidence of Directed Free-energy Technology on 911***. This unique and extraordinary book has been available to readers everywhere now for approximately two-and-a half years, and during that time not one scientific fact of the many in it has been challenged, denied, or refuted. The reason for this impermeability to scientific attack is simple: The science in the book, a fact clear to all who read it, is irrefutable.

Full disclosure requires me to mention that I’m the author of a Foreword to the book; my own choice, however, leads me to mention that the first sentence of that Foreword is this one: “The book you hold in your hands is the most important book of the twenty-first century.”

My reasons for saying this are explained in the balance of the Foreword, but I can summarize them as follows: Dr. Wood’s book is thorough, masterful, scientifically irrefutable, and the implications of what it proves are of a clear, obvious, urgent, vital, worldwide importance.

Detractors of the book—whose conspiratorial motives are endlessly obscured in a shifting darkness—attempt to discredit the book by claiming that it consists of “theory” or “opinion” rather than of scientific fact, or that it represents

“opinion” or “just one point of view” that must be considered only in light of other “points of view,” as if Dr. Wood were not a scientist but an op-ed columnist or quiz show contestant, or as if science itself were a popular debate of some kind rather than a matter of evidence leading to proof. More on all of these subjects later.

The fact is that Dr. Wood’s precision, thoroughness, and scrupulously maintained scientific objectivity produce a work that is at once impeccable and powerful. Her book does not consist of opinion nor does it put forward opinion. It does not consist of “theory” nor does it put forward “theory.” Instead, it consists of objective analysis of empirical, observable, irrefutable scientific evidence, resulting in an irrefutable scientific proof that the trade center buildings underwent a process of molecular dissociation brought about by a weaponized form of directed free-energy technology. In a word, the buildings were turned into particles of dust that then dissociated further into still smaller particles, until they became nano-particles. That’s why there was almost nothing left behind on the ground after the disappearance (not counting WTC 7) of two gigantic towers with their approximately half a million *tons* of matter each. The estimate is that roughly two percent of a million tons of building material remained at the site after the disappearance of the towers.

The significance? The significance is immense, far-reaching, and real. Dr. Wood herself has explained over and over again that she is a scientist and that, as a scientist, she will not entertain or indulge in opinion, theory, or conjecture. In her “Author’s Preface” she writes: “I do not believe that our government is responsible for executing the events of 9/11/01—nor do I believe that our government is not responsible for executing the events of 9/11/01. This is not a case of *belief* [emphasis in original]. This is a crime that should be solved by a forensic study of the evidence.”

We will return next time to this preface and to Dr. Wood’s remarks about the relationship between forensics in science and forensics in law. Meanwhile, however, without dishonoring an adherence to scientific fact, objectivity, and evidence, there are one or two very simple though obviously important things we can say. One is that a military-scientific operation or attack of the magnitude and complexity of 9/11 was obviously not planned or executed either by a man in a cave with a laptop or by nineteen irreverent pseudo-jihadist young men with box-cutters. Another simple but important thing we can say is that an entire nation has been lied to for a very long time by its entire government, whatever or wherever or whoever that government may actually be. And we can say, further, that in the name of this enormous lie, and using this enormous lie for its excuse, the United States, or whoever controls the United States, has embarked upon a decade of ruin, slaughter, conquest, brigandage, criminality, destruction, murder, and waste that creates a high danger of leading us all to WW III, that reveals no greater sense of husbandry toward a dying Earth itself than it does toward Earth’s peoples, and that shows a tendency only toward more, and more urgent, brigandage, rape, and destruction.

The monstrous, murderous lie of 9/11 has unleashed the most massive, sustained, and wretched spasm of criminality and ruin to have taken place over so short a period of time in the history of humanity.

And what is the question that follows an assertion such as that? The question that follows is simple and also boundlessly urgent and important. It is: Why on earth don’t we do something about it?

And so we are taken back to the beginning of this piece: For the past eleven years, forces of a calculating and ungoverned avarice, cruelty, and destruction have been permitted to run unchecked over the earth and over many of its peoples. These ruinous forces have been allowed and encouraged by and because of 9/11, an event we now know to have been exponentially greater and more ruinous a crime even than it was believed to be at the time it took place. The wreckage that has followed in its wake, wreckage caused and allowed by a nation’s falling for this indescribably monstrous lie, is flung across the globe in a great swath wherein lie the ruins of nations, economies, constitutions, people, laws, protections, freedoms, hopes, securities, and promises, all amidst the stench of death.

Now, supposing that you were in a position to do something about all of this depravity and destruction; supposing that you were in a position to help right even some small part of these many wrongs, assuage even some of these countless sorrows, or bring about at least a diminishment in the force of the stream of blood, dismemberment, pity, sorrow, agony, and death that gushes from so immense a cornucopia of evil; if you were in a position to help serve justice upon even some number of the bloody-souled malefactors, thieves, and murderers responsible for creating, engineering, and maintaining this sweep of malaise, disease, ruin, and evil—well, if you were in such a position as that, wouldn’t you do it, if you could?

But of course you would. And so would I. So would anyone whose conscience remains human and awake, whose heart remains capable of feeling, whose sense of justice remains impartial, alert, and free, and whose mind has not been invaded and destroyed by the paralyzing demons of false beliefs that over the years have been seeded and planted in the minds of Americans by traitors and liars.

Dr. Judy Wood has provided us with a proven truth that, indisputable and powerful, is suitable and appropriate to become a foundation piece or a powerful building block in an emerging structure of resistance against a diseased policy. We should, by now, be at a point of change and promise. We should be at a point by now when the

population had begun growing aware of the real dimension and the true depravity of the attack that was made not on their country on 9/11, but on them themselves *by* their country. With this enormous truth proven and known, we should by now be further along than we are in resisting the abominations that have come to be taken as the status quo, and further along in positioning and equipping ourselves to replace them.

But we are not further along, and the question to be asked is very, very simple: Why are we not?

And the answer is that it's because of us, because of we. The progressive-left element in our national discourse has failed totally as an alert conscience and persistently inquiring voice. Co-opted, commandeered, bought off, threatened, infiltrated—whichever of the many possibilities may pertain in each particular case, the putative left is dead. It has, in fact, with very, very few exceptions, become as much the enemy as the enemy itself.

This tremendous failure, the collaborative death of the left, is a huge, pressing, all-important subject. It is a subject that bears on every aspect of our present dilemma, from dental care to the daily odds increasingly piled up against the likely survival of the earth itself. It is a subject that must be taken up.

Next time: Grading a paper; analyzing the enemy

Eric Larsen is author of [A Nation Gone Blind](#) and [The Skull of Yorick: The Emptiness of American Thinking at a Time of Gave Peril—Studies in the Cover-up of 9/11](#). Reach him at oliveropenpress@nyc.rr.com.

DR. JUDY WOOD AND THE FUTURE OF THE EARTH: PART IV

By Eric Larsen

Posted on **September 24, 2012** by Eric Larsen

In the time that has passed since [Part Three of this essay](#), nothing has changed—except for one thing that may seem very small to most people, even unnoticeable. In actuality, though, it has enormous implications.

But let's take the nothing-has-changed aspect of matters first.

Our unfinished business from last time, in fact even from [the time before that](#), was to determine whether the piece by Missy Comley Beattie named "[Big Greed](#)" is or isn't an example of what we have been calling "impotence-writing."

And of course it is. Let me immediately add, however, that the point in saying so is not to denigrate Missy Comley Beattie but, instead, to show how much she, as a "liberal-progressive" observer and commentator, is like the dozens of others like her who, though they may not seem so, are producers also of impotence-writing and of impotence-thinking.

One helpful way to get at its true nature is to read through "Big Greed" again with this question in mind: How much of it consists of *feeling* and how much of it consists of *thinking*?

Obviously, no piece of writing—and not much thinking—can exist at all without being composed of both thought *and* feeling. But a revealing test of the nature and value of pieces of writing can be to identify what percentage of them consists of feeling as opposed to thinking, and then to identify to what extent the central, weight-bearing elements of the structure are made to rest on the sturdier foundations of thought as opposed to the less sturdy foundations of feeling, wishing, desiring, or wanting.

By both of these measures, "Big Greed" fares poorly—as do most of its counterparts produced by our small armies of "left-progressive" commentators. This doesn't mean that a piece like this is "right" or "wrong," but it will most likely determine whether it's weak or strong—and therefore how "true" it is, in the sense of "true to life."

Now. One of the signs of trouble in "Big Greed" is that the author is foggy as to whether the subject of the piece is herself, on the one hand, or something *else*. Let's look and see how this works.

The first premise of "Big Greed" is that conditions for workers in China are wretched, deplorable, crushing. An ancillary, or simultaneous, premise is that this inhuman situation, the "Chinese labor model," will arrive also in the U.S.—if nothing is done to subvert and disempower "big greed."

As I said, there's no question of the piece being "correct" or "incorrect," but only of its being strong or weak, impotent or powerful. We get a hint as Beattie, in her third paragraph, switches subjects away from labor exploitation and to herself:

When someone asks what I do, I say, "Writer and peace activist." Recently, I've written two articles about the plight of Bradley Manning. Last week, I focused on ocean health. My list of concerns is broad.

Some might ask, what's wrong with that? Again, nothing is *wrong* with it. But, as an admission of over-extendedness and hence ineffectualness, it functions almost like a sign with the word "impotence" on it.

Caught between the subject of herself and the subject of labor exploitation, the author is forced to do some quick footwork to keep things under control. She tries to slow things down by making a generalization broad enough that it can't possibly get out of her sight or squirm away: "But, really," she says, "there is only one issue—Big Greed."

Yet again, what's wrong with that? And again, nothing—except that not even this generalization is wide enough to keep Beatty on track, as we can see by the way she flips back to the subject of herself:

I am keyboarding, now, on an Apple MacBook Pro. My iPhone is nearby. Yes, I'm a hypocrite. Because I know the conditions imposed on Chinese laborers at Apple factories, including the no-suicide oath and the nets to catch those who break their promise. Workers receive \$8 for assembling an iPad that costs \$500. This is the standard that's at our threshold.

Hypocrite? How does using an Apple computer make you a hypocrite? If it's a crime for the Apple company to exploit Chinese labor (I myself think it is, though the law doesn't), then I suppose that a person, by using a MacBook, might be complicit in that crime. But why would the person be a hypocrite? I can understand someone feeling *guilt* (though Beatty doesn't mention this), but hypocrisy is a harder notion. Suppose an epidemic of cholera were taking place somewhere in the world. Then suppose someone—you, me, Missy Beattie—lived in a land free of cholera and yet had great pity and sympathy for those suffering from the disease. First question: Would this make the non-sufferer a hypocrite? Second question: If it *did* make the non-sufferer a hypocrite, could that non-sufferer shed hypocrisy by choosing to be injected with the cholera strain, thereby becoming a sufferer and no longer a hypocrite?

Absurd, of course. But this question isn't absurd: Is the author of "Big Greed," in these opening paragraphs of her piece, *thinking*, or is she *feeling*? She's doing both, of course, but which one (if either) is being done in excess of the other? And what *should* be the ratio of the two, the one to the other?

No need to answer right now, especially since the answer will become clearer as we go along. What happens next? Well, we ourselves, the readers, get accused by the author of the same guilt-trip she seems to be feeling: "Are you a hypocrite, too?" she spits at us. Well, um, I don't know. I don't use a Mac computer, so what is it, exactly, that would make me a hypocrite? Apparently there's just one other thing, or at least that's how many others Beatty cites, this one thing being "[shopping] at Walmart, the metastatic mega-retailer that's choked small stores" and that doesn't "pay employees a living wage" while itself gaining the wealth of Croesus.

Believe me, I'm a card-carrying, equal-opportunity despiser of Walmart, starvation wages, social injustice, exploitation of workers, corporatocracy, and the stealing blind of entire peoples and nations. But that's not the point. The point is what are we going to do about it? The point isn't to convince one another over and over that this is the way we feel, but the point is figuring out what's going to happen next. The point isn't to pat ourselves on the back every time we earn yet another self-serving empathy-badge to sew onto our Scout shirt. The point is to get somewhere. The point is to identify and address the enemy. The point, domestically, is to *score against* that enemy. The point is *to restore the republic, restore the rule of law, restore the Constitution, and restore the commonweal*; in world affairs, it's to restore justice, the rule of international law, and respect for the sovereignty of peoples and nations.

Or at least, all along, that's what I thought the point was, and still do. But *where's the program*?

The program certainly isn't in the hundreds of pieces like "Big Greed" that we see each month, touchy-feely camp songs of grievances that, valid as the grievances are, do more to make the collectors of them feel virtuous than they do to point a way out.

The truth is that "Big Greed," like the legions of pieces it's kin to, contains little thinking at all. The ratio of feeling to thinking in its makeup is—what—ninety-eight to one? Beatty herself, after all the tumult about "hypocrisy," simply drops that subject and goes on to compose her list of ills. Yes, they're major ills, all-important ills, grave ills—war, oppression, poverty, sickness, depredation of the Earth—but that's all they are, and that's what they remain—a *list*. What will happen as a result of their having been listed?

Nothing. Nothing will happen as a result of this piece's coming into existence, existing, and then ending.

Look at the way it does end.

Beatty herself explains that what she's doing is grist for the mill of our corporate dictators and thereby, it seems, pointless. "Big Greed," she writes,

is especially ingenious in splintering those who slog for social and political causes, separating us as we advocate this or that, oppose this or that, protest, march, rally, rail, and rant. / The powerful want us to be fractured. They depend on it. Each time articles are published about the health of the ocean and the air we breathe, the confinement of a hero whistleblower who exposes war crimes, or any cause that detracts from their insatiable avarice, the uber-wealthy fill their champagne flutes and make merry.

And so it's apparently a hopeless cause, then, a cause that's so fractured and splintered and "spun" that "We really don't have time to say, 'I work for peace.' Or, 'I am devoted to civil rights.'"

Having said this, Beatty executes another piece of quick footwork like the one she did in dropping the subject of hypocrisy. This time, it's not dropping a subject but changing one—and doing so without logic that I can follow. Peace and civil rights flutter away in the breeze as Beatty says "There is one issue, only. It is Big Greed." Then this: "And we must unite to halt it."

"Must"? "Unite"? A reader is called back to Part One of this essay, where William Rivers Pitt made his to-the-ramparts rallying cry, "**Let us show them what real American courage looks like.**" Like Missy Beatty, who cries out in "Big Greed" that "The Occupy Movement mustn't be suppressed or co-opted. It's all we've got," Pitt, too, was urging that all energies be poured into Occupy Wall Street.

Both of these pieces, "Big Greed" and Pitt's "The Finger of Fate Upon You," appeared in March of this year and are now around six months old. Some people are sure to say that this puts them out of date and drops them into insignificance. Why waste our time, they'll ask, analyzing these old relics that have nothing to do with what's happening *now*?

But the truth is quite otherwise. These two pieces not only have everything to do with what's happening now but also with what's happened over the past half-year.

And what is that? What is it that's happened, and what is it that's now happening?

The answer is: Nothing. What we've had are six more months of stalemate. No progress. Nothing good. More drone attacks, more murders abroad, another Libya being perpetrated, this time in Syria, threats of war, more war, and total war, as all the while money and wealth continue to be stolen from our nation's already-ruined people and continue to be directed either toward war or toward the pockets of the one percent.

That is, nothing has happened that's good either for the people or for the republic. Nothing good has happened on *our* side. No kind of movement or step or method has come into focus that might bring clarity—let alone action—toward reclaiming the republic, toward reclaiming the Constitution, toward reclaiming the freedoms and protections once guaranteed by that Constitution, or toward challenging, let alone ending, the monstrous and despicable breaches of international law and committing of crimes against humanity and against peace that the U.S. and its "allies" have undertaken almost since the day of 9/11 itself and that they continue to undertake up to this moment.

And why has this juggernaut of hypocrisy, evil, murder, betrayal, crime, and ruin gone on for so long, and with virtually no significant impediment? I take this question to be one of the biggest and most important questions that we and the entire world face today. Answers to it are many and well beyond the scope of this essay, but at the same time I know with certainty that impotence-writing and impotence-thinking have done nothing either to provide answers to it or to suggest pathways of significant action or response to it.

Let me put the thought another way: Impotence-writing and impotence-thought show that, by and large, what we once may have called "progressive" or "liberal" or "left" thinking seems no longer to exist in ways capable of being helpful to the people or even potentially helpful to the people, given the situation we are now in.

As I asked before, where is the program? Who has it? Who is describing it, organizing it, naming it, implementing it? Who is behind it? Missy Beatty says that what we need in order to "[incapacitate] Big Greed" is "creative strategy." That's a help. Sounding a note redolent of Pitt's "let us show them what real American courage looks like," she adds that "we must be brave." And then the excitement grows, and this "program" becomes applicable to every ill at once: "If we can accomplish this, there will be no need to write articles on behalf of Bradley Manning. There will be no war.

No war crimes to expose. It will be unnecessary to work for a healthy environment, peace, income equality, or civil rights.”

That would be very nice, but we’re still lacking specifics as to what method we might use, or, for that matter, we’re still lacking the mention of any method at all. The feeling is there, the obvious and meritorious desire to do good. But where is the practical plan?

It’s time to end this section of “Dr. Judy Wood and the Future of the Earth,” and I’ll do it with a question—or with a question and then an answer in the form of a follow-up question. The question is this: Why is it, really, that we seem to be getting nowhere, to be gaining no ground, to be reclaiming none of our republic’s freedoms and laws, to be failing to defend ourselves almost entirely against thuggery, criminality, theft, injustice, and rapine?

And the follow-up question is this: This paralysis surrounding us everywhere, this unassertiveness, this absence of effective political-intellectual life or alertness or will or action—is it conceivable that the explanation for this lassitude is not that the progressive-left itself has failed, but, instead, that the progressive-left clearly understands that the situation we’re in *really is hopeless*, that the situation we’re in *really can’t* be effectively opposed, that the power-structure as we have it now *really can’t* be re-formed or re-shaped or re-invented in the interest of the republic, of the Constitution, and of the people? Has the progressive-life become flaccid, weak, and lifeless because it really has been defeated, because the political battle really is over and done with, and because the progressive-left really has been all but destroyed and now is simply being left to die?

A thought almost imponderably hideous. But take a look at another piece from about six months ago, “**Zero Point of Systemic Collapse**,” by Chris Hedges. For a number of reasons, I have very strong reservations about Hedges, though he does write a great deal and does reach what I assume to be a considerable audience. Put that aside for the moment. The “Collapse” essay is an ambitious one, and some quoting will be necessary for us to get up to speed with it. “We stand on the cusp of one of the bleakest periods in human history,” Hedges writes,

when the bright lights of a civilization blink out and we will descend for decades, if not centuries, into barbarity. The elites have successfully convinced us that we no longer have the capacity to understand the revealed truths presented before us or to fight back against the chaos caused by economic and environmental catastrophe. As long as the mass of bewildered and frightened people, fed images that permit them to perpetually hallucinate, exist in this state of barbarism, they may periodically strike out with a blind fury against increased state repression, widespread poverty and food shortages. But they will lack the ability and self-confidence to challenge in big and small ways the structures of control. The fantasy of widespread popular revolts and mass movements breaking the hegemony of the corporate state is just that—a fantasy.

So Hedges does suggest, pretty much unequivocally, that “the political battle really is over and done with.” Here’s more from “**Zero Point**,” equally dreadful:

Democracy, a system ideally designed to challenge the status quo, has been corrupted and tamed to slavishly serve the status quo. We have undergone, as John Ralston Saul writes, a coup d’état in slow motion. And the coup is over. They won. We lost. The abject failure of activists to push corporate, industrialized states toward serious environmental reform, to thwart imperial adventurism or to build a humane policy toward the masses of the world’s poor stems from an inability to recognize the new realities of power. The paradigm of power has irrevocably altered and so must the paradigm of resistance alter.

Hedges, then, not only thinks that the battle has indeed been fought and lost, but also seems to concur with our earlier conjectures about feeling versus thinking in progressive-left writers and commentators. After mentioning the “abject failure of activists . . . to recognize the new realities of power,” he continues by saying that “The cultural belief that we can make things happen by thinking, by visualizing, by wanting them, by tapping into our inner strength or by understanding that we are truly exceptional is magical thinking,” a kind of thinking that “allows men and women to behave and act like little children . . .”

Infantilism and “magical thinking,” paralyzing in themselves, wreak even greater disability when they are combined with pseudo-politics:

We live in a culture characterized by what Benjamin DeMott called “junk politics.” Junk politics does not demand justice or the reparation of rights. It always personalizes issues rather than clarifying them. It eschews real debate for manufactured scandals, celebrity gossip and spectacles. It trumpets eternal optimism, endlessly praises our moral strength and character, and communicates in a feel-your-pain language. The result of junk politics is that nothing changes, “meaning zero interruption in the processes and practices that strengthen existing, interlocking systems of socioeconomic advantage.”

I mentioned before that I have very strong reservations about aspects of Chris Hedges' writing, and it's almost time to mention one of them. First, though, let me invoke another major online journalist and commentator whose work I try to read just as regularly as I do that of Chris Hedges—and about whom I have equally strong reservations. That writer is the widely known Paul Craig Roberts. Why invoke him? His pessimism and Chris Hedges' pessimism are pretty nearly equal in their gravity and severity. And I think that we might be able to learn something by putting the two briefly together.

Almost exactly two years ago, on September 25, 2010, Roberts posted a short piece called **"It Is Official: The US Is A Police State,"** in response to a report "on Antiwar.com that 'the FBI is confirming that this morning they began a number of raids against the homes of antiwar activists in Illinois, Minneapolis, Michigan, and North Carolina, claiming that they are "seeking evidence relating to activities concerning the material support of terrorism."'"

The raids themselves, along with the sinister notion of "material support" ("another of those undefined police state terms"), draw Roberts—understandably, in my own view—into a prognosis as negative and gloomy as any that might come from the pen of Hedges:

Americans are the most gullible people who ever existed. They tend to support the government instead of the Constitution, and almost every Republican and conservative regards civil liberty as a coddling device that encourages criminals and terrorists.

The US media, highly concentrated in violation of the American principle of a diverse and independent media, will lend its support to the witch hunts that will close down all protests and independent thought in the US over the next few years. As the Nazi leader Joseph Goebbels said, "think of the press as a great keyboard on which the Government can play."

And then, having said all this, having prepared us—not unreasonably, in my own view—for a future of witch hunts, lockdowns, lockups, and much worse, Roberts, almost as an after-thought, adds this extraordinary sentence:

An American Police State was inevitable once Americans let "their" government get away with 9/11.

With this remarkable sentence, although it may not seem so at first glance, we are brought back to the starting point of this fourth section of the essay I am calling "Dr. Judy Wood and the Future of the Earth." It becomes apparent, on reading Chris Hedges and Paul Craig Roberts, that "impotence writing," as demonstrated in its way by each of these writers, occurs among ranks of commentators and analysts much more eminent than William Rivers Pitt, Missy Comley Beatty, and others I have named. How so? Let's take the following few steps one at a time.

In their quite different ways, both Hedges and Roberts tell us that we are doomed. In Hedges' version, we face "decades, if not centuries, [of] barbarity," a condition that we have little or no hope of avoiding because "[the] elites have successfully convinced us that we no longer have the capacity to understand the revealed truths presented before us," leaving us a "mass of bewildered and frightened people" who "will lack the ability and self-confidence to challenge in big and small ways the structures of control."

Roberts' view of our near future (or what may by now have become our present) derives from premises similar to Hedges', insofar as the fault once again lies not with leaders but with the plain American "people," these being, for Roberts, "the most gullible . . . who ever existed," akin in their depravity to those who "no longer have the capacity to understand the revealed truths presented before us."

And so we're headed ineluctably either to Roberts' police state or to Hedges' condition of barbarism—unless, as Roberts' himself says all but outright, we decide, after all, not to let "our" government "get away with 9/11."

And thus we see how wretchedly caught in the beguiling spell of highly influential impotence-writers we actually are: After all, why in god's name *should* "we" let "our" government or anyone else "get away with" 9/11? The truth of *what* happened on 9/11 in the bringing about so dramatic an extent of destruction is known and has been known for several years, namely the truth that the buildings of the World Trade Center "were subjected to forces created by directed free-energy technology being used in a weaponized form," as I myself wrote **in Part Three of this essay**.

I am referring, of course, to Dr. Judy Wood and to the proof she gives, in her textbook ***Where Did the Towers Go: Evidence of Directed Free-energy Technology on 911***, that directed free energy in weaponized form was the means of destruction, and that nothing else either did or *could* have done to the buildings what in fact was done to them, namely, that they were caused to undergo a process of molecular dissociation such that they were turned to dust before they even had so much as a chance to hit the ground.

Now, I am myself a part of the group that Roberts refers to as "Americans," the species that is "the most gullible . . . [that has] ever existed." And I am a part, also, of the group that Hedges refers to as "we" and that he deplors for

being victimized by the kind of “magical thinking” that imprisons its members and makes it impossible for resistance or rebellion to be anything other than a “fantasy.”

Three statements, each of a simple truth: One, I am an American. Two: I am an American who read the book *Where Did the Towers Go?* Three: I am an American who was able to understand the book that I read.

Why is it, then, that Paul Craig Roberts won’t read it, or won’t admit to having read it, but instead **denigrates it implicitly every time he mentions 9/11**, doing so, first, by ignoring it, and, second, by continuing to declare pseudo-science (the “science” practiced by the propaganda organization **Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth**) to be true science?

And Hedges? Like Roberts and me, he, too, is an American, another member of “we.” With so despairing an outlook in regard to the growing oppression and diminishment of “us” under the pernicious “structures of control,” wouldn’t he, logically, be enormously pleased by a proven set of facts that with absolute clarity reveal the criminality of the people and institutions who control those “structures,” that with equal clarity prove those people to be traitors, murderers, and war criminals, and that, finally, could and would be used against them, in hearings and trials aimed at bringing them to justice and thus at restoring a more just and lawful balance of power between those governing and those governed—wouldn’t he be uplifted and energized by this?

I understand very well the cultural and political ruins that we live among now, and that we live *within* now. I also I understand very well the extreme danger, in fact the near-probability, that our nation and laws will fall into even greater and more misery-producing ruination than has yet been achieved. But for the very life of me, I do not and cannot understand why any living person who is in possession of a sound heart, good mind, sound conscience, and a desire for justice and the commonweal would choose to continue thinking and writing in a state of impotence rather than turning to and embracing an opportunity, rooted in fact and truth, with the promise of helping in the gaining of strength toward healing and justice.

By turning away from a source of empowerment, or by denigrating or ignoring it, such writers would in fact or in effect be *choosing* impotence. They would be *choosing* to remain in a state of impotence when remaining in that state is in fact unnecessary. They would be, in effect, through *choosing* unnecessarily to remain in their cocoon of ignorance, making it appear as though they *preferred* the state of despair over the state of hope. It would be as though they *preferred* the police state they seem to fear; it would be making it appear as though they *preferred* the barbarism they seem so overwhelmingly to dread.

And such a thing as that, a *preferring* of that sort, a willful maintaining of impotence—it simply can’t conceivably be so.

Can it?

At the beginning of this piece, I mentioned something seemingly small that might have great significance. We’ll take it up next time.

*Eric Larsen is Professor Emeritus at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, CUNY. Novelist, writer, and critic, he is also the founder, publisher, and editor of **The Oliver Arts & Open Press**. Most recently, he is author of **The Skull of Yorick: The Emptiness of American Thinking at a Time of Grave Peril—Studies in the Cover-up of 9/11**.*

DR. JUDY WOOD AND THE FUTURE OF THE EARTH: PART V — CONCLUSION

By Eric Larsen

Posted on November 12, 2012 by Eric Larsen

What in the name of all that's holy is wrong with the otherwise seemingly normal people everywhere around us—that they can't, or that they won't, conduct themselves, or above all won't conduct their *thinking*, in accordance with the simplest rules of logic?

I'm not referring to our so-called "leaders," those who are "elected" and whom we call "politicians"—I'm not referring to them, whether governors, representatives, senators, or presidents, since the very nature of their place and calling necessitates that they lie to all of us each day and all day. The way things are now, with human existence itself nearing its endgame, the base-rock requirement of being an elected politician is that such a person must never, ever, no matter what, so much as mention any of the truly dire and transparently significant issues that threaten our destruction as a race, people, nation, or world. The long and strenuous effort to become an elected public official in the first place necessitates a massive and monolithic program of lying by omission. And the further step of actually accepting or inhabiting a public office of "importance" requires that this program of lying by omission—this necessity of not mentioning the real truth about any truly significant aspect of the endgame we're now living in—becomes absolute. If politicians told the truth, it would become immediately apparent to everyone that essential, fundamental, bedrock changes must be made at once if any of us seriously hopes to survive in a state of any human dignity whatsoever. But change of almost any truly important kind is anathema to the politician every bit as much as it is to the vested interests that have paid for and paved the way to that politician's taking of office. National politics, as it now exists, is a huge edifice of deliberate and calculated blindness, a matter of compulsory not-seeing and not-saying, a vast project of programmatic, perfected, and seamless lying, primarily but far from only lying by omission.

Therefore, when I talk about those many people "everywhere around us" who either can't or won't think logically, I'm not talking about elected leaders or about "politicians." And neither am I talking about "the masses," those, though with myriad troubles of their own, do little or no thinking of the kind we're talking about, logical or not. No, the ones I'm referring to are, say, those ones more like you, or like me, people of the type who are likely to follow publications like *Intrepid Report*, likely to read at least some of the articles in it, or, very possibly, even *write* some of the articles in it or in other magazines.

So keep alert. Now and again I'll name a name, but just as often I probably won't. As a result, you alone, out of everyone else in the entire world, will know whether or not it's you whom I'm writing about. Furthermore, and even more important, you alone out of everyone else in the entire world will be in a position to say whether I'm right or wrong in the things I'm going to say about you.

And that's tremendously important, because one of the things I'm going to say—am now saying—is that "you" appear to be the possessor of an education that was effectively arrested somewhere in or around the seventh or eighth grade. Please don't be offended—after all, maybe what I just said isn't true. Also, whether I'm right or wrong to the side, you're certainly not alone in hearing what I just said. In my 2006 book, *[A Nation Gone Blind: America in an Age of Simplification and Deceit](#)*, I said roughly the same thing about hundreds of thousands, even millions, of people. Furthermore, it's not as though plenty of other precedents haven't been set in this business of lamenting American ignorance generally and, the same thing but a little more specialized, lamenting American feebleness in the understanding and uses of logic. For just one example, when I was writing *A Nation Gone Blind* and doing my own lamenting about the ignorance and intellectual poverty that were then destroying higher education in the humanities, I came upon and cited in my book something written by the American philosopher John R. Searle. It was a single sentence from an article called "The Storm over the University," and it went like this, with some of my own words introducing it:

Thought, meanwhile, is hobbled and hamstrung by the cords of feeling it's bound up in, with the result that most of the time thinking can hardly be said to be taking place at all. John R. Searle, straight-faced and without irony, wrote over a decade ago in *The New York Review of Books* that "One of the most depressing things about educated people today is that so few of them, even among professional intellectuals, are able to follow the steps of a simple logical argument." [1]

Searle's piece appeared in *The New York Review of Books* in 1990, *sixteen years* before I published *A Nation Gone Blind* and, today, no fewer than *twenty-two years* ago, lost in a dim and distant past. So my calling people—my calling you—uneducated and logic-challenged doesn't make for news in any conceivable way whatsoever.

On the other hand, it may not be a thing well calculated to make you feel pleased—my calling you deficient. Therefore, I beg you to stay alert, listen to everything carefully, and conclude for yourself whether any accusatory thing I might say is in fact true of you, or in fact is not true of you. Keep track. It's important—so important, as a glance at the title of this essay will tell you, that it has to do with nothing less than the future of the earth.

Ever since Dr. Judy Wood's *Where Did the Towers Go* came out, almost two years ago, I have been an advocate of it and have argued that it is a work of the utmost world importance. In the Foreword, I wrote to its potential readers:

The book you hold in your hands is the most important book of the twenty-first century. Let me explain why I say such a thing. *Where Did the Towers Go?* is a work, assuming that its content and message are properly and fairly heeded, that offers a starting point from which those who genuinely want to do it can begin, first, to rein in and then, perhaps, even end the wanton criminality and destructiveness of a set of American policies that took as their justification and starting point the horrific events of September 11, 2001.

A whole decade had passed since 9/11, and yet, even after that long a time, no clear resolution existed as to what had actually happened on that day. I wrote:

It is now almost a decade since 9/11 took place, and in all that time no unassailable, permanent, or, in pragmatic terms, politically influential progress has been made in determining exactly and irrefutably what took place on that day—or what did not take place.

With the publication of *Where Did the Towers Go*, that entire situation was changed. With the proof now offered in Dr. Judy Wood's book, proof that directed free-energy technology was used to destroy the towers, not only would that resolution come about, and not only would it be "*politically influential*," but it would be inevitable. And so I wrote:

But now Dr. Judy Wood, in this unique, powerful, landmark work of forensic scientific investigation, provides us at last with that determination: She shows us what did happen on 9/11. Although Dr. Wood's scientific training and understanding are deep and complex, she has the gift of being able, without compromise, to express ideas of the greatest complexity in terms readily understandable to any interested and attentive lay person.

* * *

We're starting out on year number twelve since the events of 9/11. A long time, yet the jerry-built slum-house of the party line, the "official" lies, deceits, falsehoods, myths, and platitudes, remains in place. Everywhere in the media, observers will continue to find the whole absurdity assiduously "reinforced," even in august papers like the *New York Times*, where the stalest and dustiest of the old lies are pulled out of drawers by editorial drones and inserted into copy in the most heavy-handed ways. Still, the important thing isn't to ask why the propagandists continue to propagandize. They do so because that's what they are—opportunists, propagandists, and liars, all the way from the editor of the *New York Times* on up to the president of the United States, who, as he campaigns for re-election, continues to claim that the guy watching television and wrapped in a blanket in Abbottabad was Osama bin Laden, he who, so we're told without a molecule of evidence, now rests with the fishes.

The liars and propagandists, from Obama on down, or from the ink-stained wretch at the city desk on up, will continue to ply their criminal trade and peddle their criminal goods for as long as the rewards and results of doing so appear to them more favorable than, say, switching to another set of lies or—*mirabile dictu*—perhaps even to the truth. My own great question, at this point, therefore, is not to ask *why it is* that the liars and propagandists remain committed so unflaggingly to their sinister program of lies and propaganda. My own great question, instead, is to ask why and how it can possibly be that the propaganda cow they continue to milk so unremittingly is still even capable of producing *anything*. My own great question is to ask how and why it is that the propaganda machine can possibly still *work*, why it hasn't been exposed for the tawdry, cheap, and meretricious flim-flam that it is. My own great question—in a last variant—is to ask how and why it can possibly be that Dr. Judy Wood's epochal, world-altering, unequivocal, scientific proof of what really happened on 9/11 hasn't had the effect of unifying and electrifying vast numbers of thinkers, writers, commentators and observers all across America so as to bring into existence the common resolve that alone will make possible the sweeping away of all of the propagandists' despicable, inane, and shabby props and veils, their blowing curtains and bubbling smoke-pots, their thunder-machines and slapsticks, exposing the propagandists, every one, for the repugnant deviants and repellent psychotics that they are.

Here's what I think: I think that the fault that the great propaganda machine is still working is our fault. I think that the fault lies with you, me, with us. It lies with us thanks to our impotence-thinking and our impotence-writing, where sounding good passes itself off as doing good. The fault lies with us thanks to our intellectual laziness and to our obscenely bad educations. It lies with us because—Searle was right—we are so logic-challenged that we behave like children and think we're wizards. It lies with us because we're really, really bad at science: We don't understand it, don't know what it is, don't know how it works. The fault lies with us because we're unsophisticated, unobservant,

illogical, and unscientific enough to have been played for suckers—first by one side, then by another side, then by a third—for more than a decade, quarreling and fussing among ourselves while our wealth is stolen, our nation dismantled, and our culture turned ever more surely to swill.

Angry? Yes, I am angry. I am also sick with grief, sorrow, and disappointment at the ruined state of our nation, and, attendant upon that, at the ruinous state of our nation's behavior in the world. I am more forlorn than, up to now, I ever imagined I could be. America, it would seem, is dead, and its corpse is stinking.

Now I will tell some stories.

* * *

The ganging up on Dr. Judy Wood, the programmatic ignoring of her work—by **Michel Chossudovsky** and **Paul Craig Roberts**, for two especially prominent examples—the smearing, distorting, and misrepresenting of it (a way to begin catching up on the veritable mountains of this kind of thing is by perusing Jim Fetzer's "**Judy Wood and DEWs: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly**" and then following up from there), all of these seem to me the result of abuses of logic, although whether these abuses are deliberate or not is much more difficult to say. In any case, abuses that are intended to suppress or discredit the work of Dr. Wood, or abuses that have the *effect* of suppressing or discrediting her work, are extraordinarily and massively destructive, absolutely so in the eyes of anyone who yearns to bring a stop to the on-going ruin of our nation—and our world—that began with the excuse of 9/11, that was catalyzed by it, and that has not slowed down since.

Whatever the crime, any effort to bring justice to bear on it cannot begin *until and unless the agents of justice know what the crime was*. The first step, therefore, in bringing justice to bear on any crime whatsoever must be precisely that step, of determining what the crime was.

In the case of 9/11, that step was distorted and lied about from the very beginning, and for very good reason: The perpetrators, whoever they were, most desperately wanted the *exact nature of the crime* to be unknown, and they wanted it to remain unknown. To be sure, their strategy of secrecy, lies, and the deliberate planting of confusion worked very well. Until now, that is. It worked very well until slightly less than two years ago, when *Where Did the Towers Go* was published.

The crime of 9/11, now that the truth of what the crime *was* is known, moves into a new category. Now that the truth of what *actually happened* is known, 9/11 moves into the category of a crime that is prosecutable—if not yet actually so, then without any doubt whatsoever potentially so. Knowing *irrefutably* the means by which the crime of 9/11 was committed may, at this point, be the only arrow in the quiver of those who yearn to take their country back from the craven enemies and traitors who have stolen it from the people. But that arrow is a strong and tremendously sharp one. For this reason, it is impossible for the thought not to pass through one's mind that those who programmatically suppress, misrepresent, and smear the work of Dr. Judy Wood may, intentionally or unintentionally, be working against rather than for the best interests of their nation; may conceivably, in effect, be working on behalf of the traitors, thieves, and criminals who stole and are now destroying the nation rather than on behalf of those from whom it was taken.

Why and how could such a thing be? I don't know, although I'm sure that whatever reasons exist will differ in different cases. Regarding some, I have no idea at all, while in others I suspect that the cause, or part of it, may lie in a failure of courage in the face of fear. Fear often leads people to seek shelter and safety (or what passes for shelter and safety) in group-thinking, since group-thinking makes the "thinker" less exposed and vulnerable than does individual—that is, real—thinking, which exposes just one responsible individual to scrutiny at a time. These possibilities, however, are conjectural. I do know, however, that the written language of observers and analysts often demonstrates a process or stance of *not-seeing* the irreducible truth of a subject—particularly 9/11—rather than demonstrating a steady and whole seeing of it in a way that brings a subject to a state that is irreducible and is therefore at a level consistent with the point where something can be provable. It may be impossible to know, in any given case, whether such *not-seeing* is willed or unwilled, witting or unwitting, even conscious or unconscious. In *Where Did the Towers Go*, Judy Wood placed this quotation from *A Nation Gone Blind* at the head of her Author's Preface: "Faced with intolerable ideas, or with intolerable acts, people in very large numbers have begun simply denying them, declaring them 'unreal' and thus with a word striking them out of existence. . . . But the pattern itself of *not seeing* is inescapable, evident to anyone who looks."

Language is a tell-tale medium, as are words themselves; both excel at revealing whether their user is seeing a subject truly and accurately, not seeing it truly and accurately, or perhaps trying to prevent *others* from seeing it truly or accurately. Take, for example, Jim Fetzer's "**Judy Wood and DEWs: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly**," mentioned a moment ago. Fetzer is well known as a **retired professor of philosophy**, specialist in the philosophy of science, and founder of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, and the article provides an overview of his uneasy relationship with Judy Wood's work from the time he first interviewed her on the radio, in November 2006 (though he'd known of

her well before that. “DEWs,” by the way, for those who may not know, is an acronym for Directed Energy Weapons). The relationship between Jim Fetzer as observer and Judy Wood as observed has been a vexed one, with Fetzer portraying himself varyingly as a valiant supporter of Dr. Wood; as someone, on the other hand, betrayed by her (and by the “cult” that, he argues, surrounds, supports, and idolizes her); and as a righteously injured party who gives praise and receives only contumely in return.

In May of this year, on Amazon, he posted [this review](#) of *Where Did the Towers Go*. Here is an exercise. Read the review and, in it, try to ascertain whether its author is seeing his subject, not seeing his subject, or, our third alternative, hoping to keep others from seeing it:

14 of 24 people found the following review helpful

Masterful argument by elimination, May 20, 2012

By James H. Fetzer. This review is from: “Where Did the Towers Go? Evidence of Directed Free-energy Technology on 9/11” (Hardcover)

Rather than advance a theory of her own, Judy Wood, Ph.D., has brought together an enormous quantity of high quality evidence that appropriately functions as the foundation for evaluating alternative explanations. What she has done in this masterpiece has classically been referred to as a “prolegomenon”, or as a prelude to further research. The word “indirect” belongs in her subtitle, since “Indirect Evidence of Directed Free-Energy Technology on 9/11” is exactly right.

She demonstrates that the Twin Towers cannot possibly have collapsed and that some massive source of energy was required to blow them apart and convert them into millions of cubic yards of very fine dust. That cannot have been done by thermite / thermate / nanothermite either. And she offers reasons for doubting that it was done by using mini or micro-nukes, although there is room for dispute as to whether or not she has actually shown that they cannot have been used.

What we have here is a monumental exhibition of the full range of evidence that an adequate theory of the destruction of the Twin Towers must explain. While theories may come and go—and the correct theory may not yet have crossed our minds—they are all going to be measured on the basis of the stupendous accumulation of photos, graphs, diagrams and studies that she has assembled. This is an exceptional work that moves us far forward in the study of 9/11.

Doesn't it look, at first glance, like a wonderful review, something any author would be thrilled to get? Five gold stars precede its title: “Masterful argument by elimination.”

“Masterful.” And look at some of the other adulatory words and phrases that Fetzer sprinkles around, “enormous quantity of high quality evidence,” “monumental,” “stupendous,” “exceptional.”

A rave review, it would seem—although “seem” is indeed the right word, since it's really not a rave at all. These sentences are sneaky fellows, and the words that make them up are sneaky helpers. The scientific method, as it came into being during the Enlightenment period, is a method of thought known as empiricism or as the empirical method. Under the terms of empiricism, all conclusions are, must, and can be drawn from observable evidence and from observable evidence only. Evidence must precede any and every conclusion to be drawn from it. Then, if sound logic governs in the relationship between evidence and the conclusion drawn from it, that conclusion will be irrefutable.

For a very, very simple and not perfect but still useful example, let us turn to Barfo. Evidence shows that Barfo is a dog—he drools, pants, fetches, has fur, is mammalian, gets worms, and barks. We can conclude, from this evidence, that Barfo is a dog. We can assert that all dogs have four legs, again, on observable evidence. And so we must conclude that—whether or not we may have noticed this before—that Barfo has four legs.

Now, what is actually the case with *Where Did the Towers Go*? Well, the book does compile and present an “enormous quantity of high quality evidence,” including seismic evidence, visual evidence, verbal and eyewitness evidence, physical evidence, chemical evidence, magnetic evidence, meteorological evidence, parallel evidence (that is, evidence provided by experimentation that has produced results parallel to results seen after 9/11), even historical evidence. By following all of this evidence—and the word “all” receives emphasis, since *no* known or available evidence whatsoever has been left out—by following that evidence, the observer who carefully maintains a sound logical relationship between it and any conclusions drawn from it will be led to the necessary conclusion that the destruction of the World Trade Center was caused by directed free-energy technology.

And so Fetzer is right on one point—in asserting that *Where Did the Towers Go* does not advance a theory, as Dr. Wood herself has declared—that she doesn’t “have a theory.” What she has instead is a conclusion. That conclusion is reached after analysis and observation of *all available evidence*—not just some evidence, but *all that is available*—and the conclusion indeed is conclusive, in fact irrefutable. It is a proof.

Why is it that Fetzer won’t agree in regard to this aspect of Dr. Wood’s work and publication? I don’t know. I do know of a certain number—no, a large number—of others who are in a similar kind of disagreement. One is the aforementioned Paul Craig Roberts; another is the commentator and *Intrepid Report* associate editor, Jerry Mazza, whom we’ll look at in a minute; and another is Richard Gage of Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth, whom we’ll look at in a minute as well. I’ve become aware also of other organizations, more or less parallel to the Gage group, that are closed to Dr. Wood’s conclusion—for example, [Lawyers for 9/11 Truth](#), whose web site includes an open letter with, for example, the fervently unseeing and cripplingly outdated observation that “many high-powered attorneys have questioned the Bush administration’s explanation for 9/11 itself, including why the Bush administration allowed the hijacked planes to inflict so much damage on 9/11.”

The most revealing moment in Fetzer’s review is when he asserts that Dr. Wood’s “high quality evidence” will “[function] as the foundation for evaluating alternative explanations.” I have heard the same sentiment from a number of various lay people—something like, “Dr. Wood’s argument is interesting, but the best argument, whatever it may be, will prove to be the right one in the end.” But hearing the same thing from a professional intellectual and philosopher of science is remarkable. Science advances by proof, not by argument. *Where Did the Towers Go* provides proof. Therefore, no, I’m sorry, but it won’t “function as the foundation” for anything beyond itself.

Let me make sure that my meaning is clear. I am saying that *Where Did the Towers Go* does not offer either grounds or foundation for what Fetzer calls “alternative explanations.” That is, the book does not offer foundation for “alternative explanations” of that one and only thing that the book itself has already proved. The one thing that the book has proved is that the buildings in New York on 9/11 were destroyed by the use of directed free-energy technology. That is to say, *Where Did the Towers Go* has proved only *what happened* on 9/11. *Where Did the Towers Go* has proved *the means* by which the crime was committed. Everything else is beyond book’s purview. Everything else is open to analysis and discussion. But *the means* by which the destruction was brought about—that part is finished, been proven, case closed.

Why Fetzer would choose to argue as a non-scientist, and incorrectly, is for him to know and us to wonder. Other people, as we’ll see in a moment, may or may not understand the scientific method and how it works—and they, possibly, may actually think (as I have heard them say) that in *Where Did the Towers Go* Dr. Wood is expressing an idea, an opinion, or what they often call it, using the word incorrectly, a theory. None of those words is correct. In *Where Did the Towers Go*, Dr. Wood is expressing a *proof*.

For whatever mysterious reasons that we don’t know and can’t explain, Fetzer goes on arguing and arguing, misrepresenting and misrepresenting, with the stamina of the Energizer bunny. It is impossible to know whether, on the one hand, he is an intellectual of the kind correctly identified by John R. Searle as deficient in the logic-handling department, or, on the other, whether he is a master of trickery and disguise, able to obfuscate very nearly anything with the ease of a blender reducing mixed vegetables to juice.

Nothing in Dr. Wood’s work is quite right, it seems, though its brilliance is apparent. Her book is a “masterpiece,” but at the same time its “high quality evidence” would be referred to “classically” only “as a ‘prolegomenon,’ or as a prelude to further research.” So far, this misrepresentation goes no farther than the one we’ve already seen. But then comes a new complaint. It seems a quibble, but it’s actually a major assault. About the book’s subtitle, Fetzer says:

The word “indirect” belongs in her subtitle, since “Indirect Evidence of Directed Free-Energy Technology on 9/11” is exactly right.

No, the word “indirect” does not belong in the subtitle or anywhere else, and certainly not in the phrase “indirect evidence.” Nowhere in the work can the enormously plentiful and varied types and pieces of evidence that Dr. Wood has observed and collected—nowhere can there be found any reason why they should be called “indirect evidence” as opposed simply to what they are: Evidence of directed free-energy technology on 9/11. What, for that matter, is “indirect evidence,” anyway?

And yet Fetzer, for reasons known to him alone, seems compelled to quibble on this point and others, with a near-maniac energy. Let’s turn to [“Judy Wood and DEWs: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly,”](#) where we will find—quibbling, yes, and a bushel or two of confusion.

Please lend an ear. Then ponder for a moment what it is you’ve heard:

Unfortunately, for all her good work in displaying the explanandum, what [Dr. Wood] says here does not do her work justice. For example, the claim that, *“Empirical evidence is the truth that theory must mimic,”* falls short on several grounds. Since truth and falsity are properties of sentences (or propositions), while empirical evidence consists of photographs, remnants of steel and other physical things, including dust samples and the outcome of observations, measurements, and experiments, “empirical evidence” is not the right kind of thing to be either true or false. Moreover, the idea that “theory mimic” [sic] empirical evidence compounds the semantic obstacles to making a claim that makes sense, since “mimicry” is a kind of simulation, replication, or emulation that would, were it successful, produce more of the same: more photographs, more remnants of steel and other physical things. What she should be saying is, “Empirical evidence is the data that an adequate theory must explain.”

Clear? It's true that empirical evidence isn't “true” or “false” but that instead it either is or isn't evidence of something. Fetzer is taking up and belaboring a presumably adversarial point that would in fact meet with no disagreement from Dr. Wood. Even so, he isn't content to end his paragraph without one final scolding:

What she should be saying is, “Empirical evidence is the data that an adequate theory must explain.”

Take *that*, Dr. Wood. Reading Fetzer, one feels swept back into the age of the Scholastics. Here is a last example before we part company with the professor:

Perhaps my background as a philosopher of science makes me more attune [sic] to the oddities of [Dr. Wood's] formulations, but others are equally peculiar. To claim that, *“If you listen to the evidence carefully enough, it will speak to you and tell you exactly what happened. . . . The evidence always tells the truth,”* once again, is to make an assertion that may sound appealing but does not make literal sense. Unless the evidence happens to be auditory and consist of sounds, vibrations, or other phenomena capable of being heard, which photographs, remnants of steel and most other physical things are not, the idea of “listening to the evidence” simply does not apply. I would liken this to a category mistake, such as supposing that geometrical figures, like triangles and squares, are physical things, like metal triangles and square tables, which are physical things in space/time, while the geometrical figures are abstractions, which have ideal properties and are not in space/time. Her confusion is roughly on that order. But to my surprise, she has gone even further by denying that she even has “a theory”!

This particular effort to stymie, obfuscate, and misrepresent is among Fetzer's most remarkable. A reader wonders whether Fetzer is playing another trick or whether he actually failed to catch the irony that his “criticism” of Dr. Wood contains a perfect zinger describing what he himself does over and over. Dr. Wood's phrasing, that “If you listen to the evidence carefully enough, it will speak to you and tell you exactly what happened,” declares Fetzer, “is, once again, to make an assertion that may sound appealing but does not make literal sense.”

No practitioner could hope for a more concise description of the obfuscator's art than this one, provided by the champion. Even champions have off days, however, and this professional naysayer's next step is a winner only in the category for plain, gratuitous silliness.

Fetzer apparently expects us to accept the absurdity that it's impermissible for someone to say that he or she “ran into” a friend on the street, or that someone who offers strong and unquestioning moral support is “a brick,” or to write the lines

Drink to me only with thine eyes,

And I will pledge with mine;

Or leave a kiss but in the cup

And I'll not look for wine.

That is, he is about to make the quite, quite nutty and preposterous claim that figures of speech can and must have no meaning other than their literal meaning. Under the terms of this absurd rule, the phrase “listen to the evidence” can be applicable only to “evidence [that] happens to be auditory and [to] consist of sounds, vibrations, or other phenomena capable of being heard,” ruling out “inaudible” evidence like “photographs, remnants of steel and most other physical things.”

It reminds me of being in college and having to suffer under the most pedantic and vainglorious prof in the school. And so, entirely in character, the pontificating Fetzer fills up this particular balloon with hot air, as we saw before:

I would liken this to a category mistake, such as supposing that geometrical figures, like triangles and squares, are physical things, like metal triangles and square tables, which are physical things in space/time, while the geometrical

figures are abstractions, which have ideal properties and are not in space/time. Her confusion is roughly on that order.

I'm sorry, but no, it isn't "roughly on that order" at all. The entire lecture is baloney. And phony Fetzer knows it perfectly well.

* * *

Every inch as fraudulent but far less entertaining are the trickery, misrepresentations, and professional falsehoods of Richard Gage and his "Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth." I assume that readers—those few who may still be with me—are as exhausted by the reading of this lengthy essay as I am by the writing of it, and so I will be as brief as possible.

Let me, therefore, go straight to the story of the relationship between Richard Gage's group and the work of Dr. Wood. Synopsis of story: Gage knows full well that *Where Did the Towers Go* proves positively that his own arguments about "planned demolition" are wrong, indefensible, incorrect, misleading, and false. He thus does everything possible to ignore Dr. Wood, her book, and all that the book contains.

Now, ignoring the book means ignoring the evidence that it contains—evidence proving that the towers were destroyed not by "planned demolition" but by directed free-energy technology. Thus, being suppressors of evidence, Gage and his group are by definition non-ethical, non-professional, and non-scientific.

They should therefore be repudiated and exposed, dismissed from any form of serious consideration whatsoever as participants in the debates about 9/11 truth, and, further, they should be censured both by their own professional associations and by the scientific community worldwide.

The story of this group's intellectual bankruptcy, scientific misprision, and intent to continue with its established program of lies is told most briefly and clearly by Andrew Johnson in his excellent and indispensable book, *9/11, Finding the Truth* (download the book free at the [iTunes Bookstore](#)).

The story goes this way, chronicled by Andrew Johnson:

. . . [A] Medical Student named Abraham Hafeez Rodriguez . . . found out [that] his name had been deleted from the AE911 truth supporters' petition following his efforts to raise awareness of Dr Judy Wood's research. Abe had been a donor to the group as he supported their (apparent) efforts to uncover what had happened on 9/11.

Abraham explained that his name was removed from the petition following his sending Richard Gage a private email, which contained a question about Dr. Wood. He asked Richard Gage if he had ever heard of her or her research, and if he would be willing to contact her to collaborate and help support her legal cases. He never heard back from Richard Gage.

Abe began posting material and comments in relation to Dr Judy Wood's research and also information about Dr Steven E Jones [sic] connections into Los Alamos National Labs. He had posted information on a number of forums (including [the UK 9/11 "truth" forum which I helped set up in 2005](#)). After a few days, he discovered his name had been deleted from the AE911 petition.

Abe explained that it was strange that they could later contact him to offer a refund, but they couldn't reply to an email that was intended to help Richard Gage and AE911Truth.

Every bit as transparent as it is fascinating, the story reveals the obvious fact that the very last thing either Richard Gage or his deceitfully- and **hypocritically-named group** has the least interest in any "help" whatsoever. "Truth"? Did I hear the word "truth"? A proper name for Gage's group would be Scoundrels, Liars & Anti-Scientists for 9/11 Deception.

Let me explain, or, rather, let the organization itself explain.

As chronicled by Andrew Johnson, Abraham Rodriguez finally did receive an email in response to his concerns about having been "unsigned" from the petition, but not an email from Richard Gage. Instead, it came from one Mark Graham. Here are parts of it, as cited in *9/11, Finding the Truth*:

From: Mark Graham [mailto: mgraham@ae911truth.org]

Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 8:45 PM

To: Abrahm@Mindoutpsyde.com

Subject: Abrahm [sic], a message from Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth

Abrahm [sic],

I am writing to you on behalf of Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth to explain why we removed your name from our list of petition signers and to offer you a full refund of your generous donations.

We decided to remove you from our list of petition signers because, whether you knew it or not, we have chosen to carefully limit the scope of our message to the collapse of the World Trade Center and the need for a new investigation that would specifically consider the use of explosives in bringing it down. . . .

At the time this letter was written, *Where Did the Towers Go* had not yet been published, but the information and research that it was to contain were prominently available online—where Abraham Rodriguez had seen and studied them.

And where Gage and his people had also seen and studied them—or I'm a monkey's uncle. If you haven't seen it before, now would be a good moment to have a look at [Abraham Rodriguez Exposes Richard Gage, Part One](#), since this video so dramatically shows Richard Gage's powerful "arm's-length" policy in regard to any and all unknown other than his own that might shed light on the truth of what happened on 9/11. For that matter, it's an equally good time, also, to take a look at [Abraham Rodriguez Exposes Richard Gage, Part Two](#).

There. Now that you've seen those two videos, we can return to the email sent by Mark Graham to Abraham Rodriguez and to its explanation of the Gage organization's stance toward the research and findings of Dr. Judy Wood. To wit:

Your suggestion about contacting Judy Wood and engaging in a discussion with her about her theories about directed energy weapons and other things is a suggestion for action that is outside the scope of our message. We would lose more than we would gain [sic]. If nothing else we would lose the time required to make such a contact and engage in a discussion/debate whose duration would be unknown. We are also well aware of Judy Wood and her theories. The reason we don't support her or her theories is that they are outside the scope of our message.

There is a lot of evidence besides the characteristics of controlled demolition seen in the collapse of the Twin Towers and Building 7 that strongly suggests or proves that the official story of 9/11 is false. As you know, 9/11 is a very complicated subject. Yet Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth deliberately avoids those topics. We; leave it to others to make those arguments and present the evidence to the public, to Congress and so on.

Where does one begin in the task of citing the inanities in just these two paragraphs? Oh, America of non-readers! Oh, America of science-ignorance! Oh, America, land of adult intellectuals who are unable to follow the steps even of a simple logical argument! Where are the nurturing guardians of the intellectuals, where are the quality controllers? Where are the instructors and professors and the examiners? Gone? All gone? Who is left to help us? To whom can we turn for absolute assurance that no one—no one—with a mind like the mind of Mark Graham shall ever—ever—be allowed near an architectural or engineering project of any kind, no matter what?

This, then, is the shabby band of crude propagandists referred to repeatedly—by such as Paul Craig Roberts, for example—as being reputable, professional, reliable, and so on: **"The professionals and the scientists are speaking from the basis of years of experience and expert knowledge,"** says Roberts.

Can Paul Craig Roberts conceivably be serious? Is it because these fellows with their "years of experience" are too lazy, or maybe just too afraid of over-taxing their minds, to do so basic a thing as look into what shows every likelihood of being new research of a kind most piercingly relevant to their own interests? God forbid that they might consider budgeting some *time* for such research: "We would lose more than we would gain," said Mark Graham. "If nothing else we would lose the time required to make such a contact and engage in a discussion/debate whose duration would be unknown."

Or maybe what Paul Craig Roberts so much admires about them, what makes him feel so deeply trusting of them is the unflagging and unflinching *focus* on their work that they maintain, absolutely blind to distraction. When Mark Graham says to Abraham Rodriguez that "We are also well aware of Judy Wood and her theories [anyway]," he actually proves the opposite by using the word "theories," these being the very last thing Dr. Wood has. But it doesn't matter, since Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth isn't about to admit having looked at or thought about or analyzed anything whatsoever having to do with the research and writing of Dr. Wood. Why not? Try this for a zinger that'll deepen your confidence in the experienced professionals: "The reason we don't support her or her theories," writes Graham, "is that they are outside the scope of our message."

I don't know about Paul Craig Roberts or Richard Gage, but when I was in school it was a flunk-for-sure tactic to ignore evidence relevant to your subject, especially if you knew it was there and ignored it to keep things simpler, and double-especially if it would have required an alteration in or a modification of, or maybe even a complete redefining of, your thesis. Skipping evidence to keep things easier—and less true, I might add—would get you a one-way ticket out of grad school faster than just about anything. That kind of scholarship was not just akin but sibling to “fixing the evidence around the policy,” and fixing the evidence around the policy is the same as—that's right, as lying.

But maybe that seems okay to Richard Gage and Paul Craig Roberts. Maybe they went to lesser schools. Maybe that's why they don't mind it when they read evidence of intellectual falsehood and fraud like this (again, for this and much more, go to [Andrew Johnson's book](#)): “There is a lot of evidence besides the characteristics of controlled demolition seen in the collapse of the Twin Towers and Building 7 that strongly suggests or proves that the official story of 9/11 is false. As you know, 9/11 is a very complicated subject. Yet Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth deliberately avoids those topics.”

Great. It really helps keep things simple. It's much, much faster and more efficient just to shut your eyes to all but one thing and then say to all the rest—*Hence! Away! begone!*

I'm sure this method is what has made Gage's two-hour plus movie, [9/11 Explosive Evidence—Experts Speak Out](#) such a big success. I have an idea. To help underscore the intellectual excellence and the scientific authority of the movie, let's make a list of just *some* of the evidence it ignores, leaves out, or fails to explain in relation to the movie's thesis that the buildings were destroyed by planned demolition:

- 1) Seismic evidence indicating the absence of 1,000,000 tons of building mass hitting the earth
- 2) The absence of 1,000,000 tons of building mass in the debris pile (the pile equaled 2% of the total mass)
- 3) The fact of damage to buildings adjacent to the towers appearing only below eighteenth-floor level
- 4) Changes in Earth's magnetic field at the time of each building's destruction
- 5) Flames that failed to ignite paper, failed to singe tree leaves, and in many cases failed to harm flesh or burn clothing
- 6) The absence of high heat throughout the process of destruction
- 7) The absence of damage to the concrete “bathtub” under the buildings that is there to hold river water out
- 8) The engine blocks of automobiles missing entirely
- 9) Automobiles having been “toasted” in patterns inconsistent with oxidization
- 10) Fire trucks and other vehicles being flipped over with no sign of heavy wind or concussive force having been present
- 11) the sudden exploding of objects, people, vehicles, and steel tanks
- 12) Circular holes having appeared in glass panes while the panes remained intact
- 13) The presence of thunder on 9/11 recorded at all three major metropolitan airports
- 14) The presence of hurricane Erin offshore from NYC on 9/11, a category three storm that went unreported on news media and that abruptly changed course away from NYC after the towers' destruction

And more. But let it rest. What on earth is going on? An ignorant and uninformed movie, an ignorant and uninformed group of reputable and lauded professionals, then yet another ignorant and uninformed group of an exactly parallel kind. And these are only one or two of the stories I have to tell. What about all of the publications, institutions, organizations, columnists, clearing houses, newspapers, magazines—all of them, in this same Gage-ian and Robertsonian way, ignorant and uninformed, all of them either knowingly or unknowingly, purposely or ignorantly, actively or passively, participating in the cover-up of a book of scientific research and discovery that to my way of thinking—as I have said before, although perhaps not here, and as I will say again, is as revolutionary, important, and significant for us now as Copernicus, Galileo, or Darwin were revolutionary, important, and significant for us then.

Many of these people, publications, parasites, and institutions are noted and named in *The Skull of Yorick*, although that doesn't matter much, since Americans, mostly, read and write not to remedy their ignorance but to reinforce and flatter it. Life is so much easier and more comfortable that way.

It's beyond time to end, but other stories keep knocking at the door. Here are three.

1) The friend, successful writer, and known journalist, who wrote during an exchange of emails:

9/11 shot America right between the eyes. Was it a .44 magnum . . . a 30-06 . . . a directed energy weapon . . . EVERYTHING that really matters, it's all the same.

Okay, perhaps the physical cause of the wound might in some way influence the choice of treatment? But what our maximum energies should focus upon is the wound itself, who inflicted the wound, and how to stop them from further wounding—indeed, HOW TO wreak justice upon them.

How much difference would it make to what matters most whether Judy Wood is “right”, or what I believe is “right”?

Indeed, in the realm of what matters above all, how would it make any difference whatsoever?

Who received this from me in answer:

Do you think that in a murder trial in a court of law where you were, say, the prosecuting attorney, it “wouldn't matter” if you were unable to say how a murdered victim came to be dead? Suppose you were unable to say whether the dead guy died by slingshot, 22 rifle, “.44 magnum [or] 30-06” or, hell, by poison or by burning?

If you couldn't identify the type of murder weapon, you'd have no case, or at very, very best a wildly weak one. You write that “what our maximum energies should focus upon is the wound itself, who inflicted the wound, and how to stop them from further wounding—indeed, HOW TO wreak justice upon them.” But, X, that's a gobbledygook mouthful. In court, you'd be a dead duck. What in the devil's name are you basing your case on? Are you basing it on “the wound itself”? Are you basing it on proving “who inflicted” the wound? Are you basing it on “wreaking vengeance,” a concept having nothing whatsoever to do with justice?

And whom I haven't heard from since, except through his angry silence.

2) The friend, writer, teacher, poet, and erstwhile political radical to whom I sent a copy of *Where Did the Towers Go* because he himself was broke at the time. When it seemed clear to me that he wasn't going to read it, I asked him why not. The reasons were solipsistic and made up of a battered and weakened logic worthy of Richard Gage. Here are parts of his response as he describes his giving up, turning inward, dropping out, removing himself to a faux-edenic place of self-gratulation and self-indulgence as nation, people, and planet take care of themselves in their dying:

It couldn't be clearer to me that our world is one in which 9/11 was just the latest of ineffable horrors inflicted upon a gullible many by an evil, self-serving few, serviced and protected by a great many willing parties to great crimes and an even greater number of useful idiots. That's pretty much where things stand for me. Is anything Judy Wood says going to change any of this for me?

I'm aware of so much more than when you and I used to write—though my intuition was already showing these things to me—that to engage at any level of American politics now would be to engage in a fiction which I know to be just that. There exists no law, no United States, no semblance of good in the system that one could ever hope for good from.

There will be no justice for 9/11, nor for any of the near-infinite other crimes at least as great. No party, no movement, no group of truth-tellers is to be trusted, ever. Anything which gains an iota of traction is immediately infiltrated. The only thing I can do is to keep my own soul, my inner truth, my higher self—whatever you want to call it—pure and whole, and to act spontaneously out of that integral place.

With a bow to you, dear sir, for all that you do, and, again, for sending me Judy Wood's book. One day I'll perhaps read it. At this point in my life, it's like having a dusty copy of a great Greek or Roman work on my shelves. I prefer to live, say, with the wisdom of the I Ching, or one of Deng Ming-Dao's books, or, even better, the quiet whisperings of my own soul within.

3) The journalist and *Intrepid Report* associate editor, Jerry Mazza, posted an article (containing contributions from Christopher Bollyn) on September 5 called [“9/11 widow hoping for Supreme Court review.”](#) Its subject: 9/11 widow Ellen Mariani and her decade-long struggle for a fair hearing, with Supreme Court review being her final hope at the time the article appeared.

After reading the article, Emmanuel Goldstein wrote to Jerry Mazza in care of Intrepid Report, asking if he knew about the science fraud case that Dr. Wood had brought in 2009:

I noticed in your article about the Ellen Mariani Legal Defense Fund that [Mariani] wants to present her case to the U. S. Supreme Court. Are you familiar with [Dr. Judy Wood filing a federal qui tam case with the U. S. Supreme Court against the contractors who contributed to the official NIST report about the destruction of the WTC for science fraud](#) in December of 2009?

The result of Emmanuel Goldstein’s query was that an angry Jerry Mazza reminded Goldstein that one of the things he, Mazza, dislikes about Dr. Wood is “her sense of inviolable superiority.” He mentioned me, too, saying that [my review](#) of *Where Did the Towers Go* was, like Dr. Wood, narrow-minded:

In fact, [the review] iterated the same hard-headed, steel-plated point of view that *Where Did the Towers Go* propounded. It made no attempt to listen to anyone else or see the circumference of traitors surrounding the 9/11 drama, responsible for Where the Towers Went.

I’m sorry, but here is a very, very serious question that I see no way of avoiding: What on earth is going on when accusations of “hard-headed, steel-plated [points] of view” are made against *scientists*? I can’t believe it, but does Mazza actually not realize or understand that science isn’t the same as opinion? The same as argument? As “point of view”? Does he, even, after having read it himself, actually think that a logical or relevant criticism of the book (not to mention my review of it) is that it “made no attempt to listen to anyone else or see the circumference of traitors surrounding the 9/11 drama”?

Either he read a different book than I did or he’s misremembering, but *Where Did the Towers Go* neither has nor ever intended to have anything whatsoever to do with “the circumference of traitors surrounding the 9/11 drama.” It is a science book. It sets out to do one thing and one thing only, and that’s to show scientifically and physically *what happened* on 9/11. Any considerations of who did it or why they did so or what might happen afterward are outside the scope of Dr. Wood’s research. A good scientist in fact makes an enormous effort *not* “to listen to anyone else” but, instead (pay attention, Dr. Fetzer), to “listen to the evidence” and only to the evidence, since it’s that alone that will or can “tell you exactly what happened.”

Mazza both cites and decries the setbacks and sequential injustices that have been the lot of Ellen Mariani as she “has been in the courts duking it out with the Zionist Judge Alvin Hellerstein and his cohorts for 11 years.” He remarks on Hellerstein’s ugly “comment . . . that ‘Money is the universal lubricant’ and adds that he himself “was in the courtroom when a two not three member panel of appellate court justices, faced Mr. Bruce Leichty, Mrs. Mariani’s attorney, and determined later to threaten Leichty and Mariani with financial sanctions, another disgrace.”

Then comes this absolutely remarkable, highly revealing, and entirely misleading paragraph:

But you see, Dr. Wood cannot see beyond the scientific Petri Dish that she turned 9/11 into, forgetting about the human circumference of that dish, the players like Larry Silverstein, who raised the WTC insurance weeks before 9/11 to \$3.5 billion and who after the horror wanted to be paid twice, claiming the Towers that fell were separate events. Then there’s Victim Compensation Fund ‘Special Master’ Kenneth Feinberg who gave away \$7 billion to victim families but not a cent to Mrs. Mariani. There is Louis Eisenberg who authorized the lease of the WTC complex to Silverstein at a tiny fraction of its value. There is Frank Lowy, owner of Westfield, who paid but \$127 million for a 99-year lease for the retail areas in the WTC thanks to Mr. Eisenberg, who managed the New York/New Jersey POA and delivered the WTC into Zionist hands. All of these men have dual passports, dual citizenships and ties to Zionist Israel. This is not a theory, it’s a fact. And there many more names to cite. But living in her Petri Dish, Dr. Wood refuses to see the most probable cause of the Towers demise, human greed and perfidy.

I may as well begin with the horse-pill-sized anti-science trope that Mazza himself opens with. Dr. Judy Wood has not “forgotten” anything whatsoever about “the human circumference” of 9/11, nor are either her research or her book a “Petri Dish,” by which I assume Mazza, in his own science-philistine view, means something blind, narrow-minded, inhumane, and tunnel-visioned. In regard to his scorn for Petri dishes themselves, talk about an ingrate! I’m given to understand that in the absence of such scientific and micro-biological research and detection as Julius Richard Petri’s dish has made possible over the past century and more, a very, very great many of us who are now among the living would be enjoying ourselves, as best we might, among the dead.

Further, as regards the “human circumference” of 9/11, I know of no living person public or private anywhere in the world more absolutely dedicated to the humanity and to the human life either lost, being lost, or being jeopardized by 9/11 in all of its ramifications than Dr. Judy Wood. A person need only read her third chapter, “The Jumpers,” to feel on one’s very pulse the depth and steadiness of compassion Dr. Wood feels for those who suffer and especially for those who are made to suffer because of criminal injustice and ice-cold, reptilian inhumanity.

Consider the sheer effort that Dr. Wood has made, the years and years and years of observation and study and research, not to mention the additional effort and time given to the actual writing of the monumental *Where Did the Towers Go*. Would anyone lacking a sense of or sympathy for the human dimension of the present political moment go to so immense an effort to bring hope and a concrete step toward relief and security to millions of people who are now in harm’s way?

Something is wrong at the heart of Mazza’s paragraph. Its gears are slipping. It’s trying to drive off in two directions at once. Dr. Wood has buried herself in a Petri dish and so she can’t see that “human greed and perfidy” are what “caused” 9/11. But she never intended to look at or study the “cause” in that sense. She set out instead to determine the “cause” in the sense of finding out what the *means* of destroying the World Trade Center buildings was. And she did it. She looked, saw, observed, listened, compared, organized, then looked further, listened further, compared further and determined scientifically, without any doubt whatsoever, that the buildings were destroyed by directed free-energy technology. Mazza, meanwhile, excoriates and castigates her for not having written a book on the *motives* for 9/11. And, for his own strange and curious reasons, he lambastes her on top of it for being insensitive to humanity.

What conceivable reason can there be for his being so angry about Dr. Wood’s proving the physical means by which the World Trade Center buildings were destroyed? In matters concerning 9/11 and the tyranny it has brought about, the tyranny it has imposed upon both us and upon the world, Dr. Wood has given us the equivalent of the liberating wealth of all the Indies, a way toward liberation from an absolutism of tyranny—and is castigated, snubbed, smeared, and scorned for it.

Why? Why do my own friends and correspondents and fellow writers scorn, sidestep, ignore, repudiate, or abandon Dr. Wood and her work? Why do Paul Craig Roberts, Richard Gage, James Fetzer, and Jerry Mazza do so? Why does **Matthew Rothschild** at the *Progressive Magazine* do so? Why the *New York Times*? Why Amy Goodman at Pacifica, Tom Englehardt at The Nation Institute, and **Christopher Hayes** at *The Nation* itself? Why Noam Chomsky? Why the *Atlantic*, *Harper’s*, *The New Republic*? Why **Frank Rich** and **Don DeLillo**? Why. . . .

But enough. The list is long, we all grow tired, and, often for reasons that I don’t fully understand, passions run high. After providing a catalogue of the “Zionist players” who may well have been—or were—involved in or supportive of the 9/11 crime, Jerry Mazza signs off this way: “I rest my case and would rather not hear from you [Emmanuel Goldstein] or Dr. Woods [*sic*] or Dr. Larson [*sic*] again. The lot of you disgust me.”

With nothing less than the survival of our nation, our people, our world, and our life under the rule of law at stake, this—well, this sort of splenetic myopia and pontifical self-righteousness— isn’t going to get us very far.

I ask only, Can’t America do better? If it can’t, I fear gravely, and I grieve, for where all of us are headed.

Note:

1. “The Storm over the University,” *The New York Review of Books*, Dec. 6, 1990

Eric Larsen is author of the novels *An American Memory*, *I Am Zoe Handke*, and *The End of the 19th Century*. His next novel, *The Decline and Fall of the American Nation*, will be published soon. Larsen is also author of ***A Nation Gone Blind: America in an Age of Simplification and Deceit*** (2006) and ***The Skull of Yorick: The Emptiness of American Thinking in a Time of Grave Peril—Studies in the Cover-up of 9/11*** (2011).